

APR 12 1938

0

RDTA

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES  
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS · PUBLISHERS

VOLUME XXIX · APRIL 1938 · NUMBER TWO

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is edited by Horatio Smith and an advisory board consisting of Jean-Albert Bédé, Dino Bigongiari, Louis Cons, John L. Gerig, Arthur Livingston, Henri Muller, Federico de Onís and Norman L. Torrey. The secretary of the REVIEW is Justin O'Brien.

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis., or 2960 Broadway, New York City: Single copies, \$1.00 (foreign, \$1.10) \$4.00 a year (foreign, \$4.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect.

Manuscripts, editorial communications and books for review should be addressed to Professor Horatio Smith, 504 Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE ROMANIC REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the "Notes for Contributors" at the end of the issue of April 1938 (Vol. xxix, No. 2).

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis., or 2960 Broadway, New York City.

Very nearly complete sets, beginning with the first issue in 1910, and separate years of THE ROMANIC REVIEW are still available; libraries are entitled to a reduction on back issues when orders are sent directly to THE ROMANIC REVIEW.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1938 by Columbia University Press.

THE ROMANIC REVIEW  
A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

VOL. XXIX

APRIL, 1938

No. 2

CONTENTS

Dante Notes	H. D. AUSTIN	107
The Significance of the Criteria of Latin Paleography in the Study of Anglo-Norman Documents	S. HARRISON THOMSON	112
D'une chanson du Bas-Poitou que Rabelais a pu connaître	MAURICE EDGAR COINDREAU	120
A Source of <i>Ibrahim ou l'Illustre Bassa</i>	ALGERNON COLEMAN	129
American Scholarship in the Field of Eighteenth- Century Anglo-French Studies	DONALD F. BOND	141
Diderot and the Idea of Progress	LESTER GILBERT KRAKEUR	151
Trends in Recent Criticism of the Eighteenth-Century French Theatre	EDITH MELCHER	160
Maurice Barrès' Collaboration with the Action Française	W. M. FROHOCK	167
<i>Faire une scarlatine (une typhoïde)</i>	LEO SPITZER	170

REVIEWS

Jean Györy, <i>Etude sur la Chanson de Roland</i> . [LOUIS CONS]	173
William A. Nitze and collaborators, <i>Le Haut Livre du Graal, Perlesvaus. Volume II: Commentary and Notes</i> . [ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS]	175

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

## REVIEWS CONTINUED

Amédée Pagès, <i>La Poésie française en Catalogne du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup></i> . [H. C. HEATON]	180
Helen Reese Reese, <i>La Mesnardière's "Poétique" (1639): Sources and Dramatic Theories</i> . [COLBERT SEARLES]	183
Hester Hastings, <i>Man and Beast in French Thought of the Eighteenth Century</i> . [LEONORA COHEN ROSENFELD]	186
C. W. Hendel, <i>Citizen of Geneva: Selections from the Letters of Jean-Jacques Rousseau</i> . [NORMAN L. TORREY]	188
Thaddeus Ernest Du Val, Jr., <i>The Subject of Realism in the "Revue des Deux Mondes" (1831-1865)</i> . [CLAUDE P. VIENS]	190
Mona E. Mackay, <i>Meredith et la France</i> . [W. M. FROHOCK]	192
Raphael Levy, <i>Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français</i> . [MARIO A. PEI]	194
<i>Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie offerts à Jacques van Ginneken</i> . [MARIO A. PEI]	195
Ferdinand Brunot, <i>Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900. Tome IX: La Révolution et l'Empire, Partie II: Les Evénements, les institutions et la langue</i> . [HENRI F. MULLER]	197
R. L. Graeme Ritchie (ed.), <i>France: A Companion to French Studies</i> . [I. W. BROCK]	199
Emile Leroy, <i>Guide des Bibliothèques de Paris</i> . [H. S.]	200
Books Received	201
Notes for Contributors	203



---

## DANTE NOTES

---

### "ERROR" OR "HORROR"? (*Inf.*, III, 31)

THE QUESTION whether Dante wrote "error" or "error," in the clause "[io] ch'avea d'error (orror) la testa cinta," has been decided one way or the other mainly on the basis of possible echoes from Dante's own reading. The majority of editors have favored "error," as against the less satisfactory "error"; though the *Testo critico*, evidently following the criterion of *lectio difficilior*, has accepted "error," which is said<sup>1</sup> to be the reading of a preponderating number of the manuscripts,<sup>2</sup> including some of the oldest and best.

In support of the reading "orror," *Aeneid*, II, 559, has been most often quoted: "At me tum primum saevus circumstetit horror." Moore<sup>3</sup> thought that, because of the context—Aeneas has just entered the Lower World, and is awed by its grim sights and horrid sounds—the passage of *Aen.*, VI, 559, was more apt: "constitit Aeneas strepitumque exterri-tus hausit." Scartazzini advanced, in justification of his acceptance of "orror," also one Biblical passage, *Daniel*, VII, 15: "*Horruit* spiritus meus, ego Daniel territus sum in his, et visiones capitis mei conturbaverunt me."<sup>4</sup>

If the matter is to be decided on the basis of parallels, there is a passage from *II. Maccabees* which should not be neglected; it comes in the same chapter (III) as that containing the Heliodorus episode mentioned in *Purg.*, XX, 113,<sup>5</sup> and is in fact a part of the same account. The minister of King Seleucus enters the Temple, to appropriate the treasure, and the High Priest stands in pale horror at the sacrilege. The *Vulgate* version of vss. 16 and 17 reads: "Jam vero qui videbat summi sacerdotis vultum, mente vulnerabatur: facies enim et color immutatus

1. Scartazzini, Leipzig ed. of *D.C.*, I, 49.

2. "Error" is preferred—to cite some of the leading moderns—by Scartazzini, Casini, Torraca, Steiner, V. Rossi, Casella, Grandgent, S. A. Barbi; and, in *Bulletino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S., XXV, 41, M. Barbi favors "error" strongly.—Vandelli, however, has preserved "error" in his 9th edition.

3. *Studies in Dante*, I, 192.

4. In the English version, the critical word, "*horruit*," is weakened down to "grieved": "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me."

5. As one of the examples of Avarice: "Iodiamo i calci ch'ebbe Eliodoro."

declarabat internum animi dolorem. *Circumfusa* enim erat moestitia quaedam viro, et *horror* corporis, per quem manifestus aspicientibus dolor cordis ejus efficiebatur."<sup>6</sup> Dante's familiarity with this particular part of the *II. Maccabees* is further shown by the fact that he refers to the book by name, in *Inf.*, xix, 85 f., where he mentions the "Jason" of the next chapter (iv) after the one from which we have just quoted.<sup>7</sup> The absence of the exact word "head" in the passage from *Maccabees*, as against its presence in the *Daniel* extract, is fully made up for by the presence of the precise noun "horror" combined with the figure of its being "around" the person; and the accompanying allusions to the "face" of the High Priest, as betraying his state of mind, help to localize the imagined encircling with horror, in a way easily suggestive of the figure in our Dante passage.

HEAVEN, SPHERE, OR CIRCLE?  
(*Purg.*, xv, 2)

"As much as between the ending of the third hour and the beginning of the day appears of the *spera* that ever like a child (*fanciullo*) disports, so much was seeming now to be left to the sun of his course toward the evening."<sup>8</sup> The early commentators are confusing and prolix as to just what "*spera*" means here; while the later ones are divided among: the "heavens" as a whole, the Heaven of the Sun, the Sun itself, and the ecliptic. The greater number, from Buti on, take it to mean the sphere in which the Sun is fixed, that is, the Heaven of the Sun, "*with especial reference to the circle of the ecliptic.*"<sup>9</sup>

Without wishing to discuss the possibility that Dante may elsewhere have used *spera* to mean "circle"—especially in *Par.*, xxiv, 11<sup>10</sup>—I should like to suggest that the interpretation of the smallest number,<sup>11</sup> that it means the Sun itself, is recommended if we apply the criterion of gender-consonance to the accompanying word "*fanciullo.*" It is a

6. Translated rather "literally" this is: "Now indeed whoever saw the countenance of the High Priest was wounded in mind: for his face and changed color was making manifest the inner grief of his spirit. For there was a certain grief *poured around* the man, and a *shuddering* of the body, whereby the pain of his heart was made manifest to the onlookers."

7. "Nuovo Iason sarà, di cui si legge / ne' *Maccabei*. . ."

8. *Purg.*, xv, 1-5: "Quanto tra l'ultimar dell'ora terza / e 'l principio del dì par della *spera* / che sempre a guisa di fanciullo scherza, / tanto pareva già inver la sera / essere al sol del suo corso rimaso."

9. Scartazzini's statement that this is the explanation of "tutti i moderni" is inexact.

10. The blessed souls "si fero *sphere* sopra fissi poli."—The reference to Fortune, *Inf.*, vii, 96, as turning her "*spera*" should perhaps also be considered: Fortune is regularly depicted as revolving a *wheel*.

11. Among them Pietrobono.

well recognized principle that words designating persons or animals are normally made to *agree in gender* with nouns to which they are related in the capacity of metaphors or similes.<sup>12</sup> In the very next canto we find the feminine form, "fanciulla," in a simile, harmonizing in gender with "anima" which it anticipates two verses ahead.<sup>13</sup> This is exactly the same interval which separates our "fanciullo" from the masculine noun "sole" which follows in vs. 5 of the same sentence, and which is the only masculine noun in the sentence to which it *could* refer. Adding to this the fact that two cantos later the phrase "*spera* del sole" is used definitely in the sense of the visible sun itself,<sup>14</sup> it would seem that the masculine "fanciullo" was chosen to lead up definitely to the noun "sole." The only difficulty in taking "*spera*," here, as referring to the sun itself is that in the correlative clauses, "quanto . . . par de la *spera*," and "tanto pareva . . . essere . . . del suo corso rimaso," the first clause seems slightly strained in expression, with "quanto" requiring a time-value which does not appear, at least superficially, in its related "tanto." This disharmony, however, is probably more apparent than real.

RENEGADE ROME  
(*Purg.*, XVI, 103-108)

In the course of his lament on the Church's faithlessness to her mission, Mark the Lombard—who says that he had learned of the world, and loved that manly worth and virtue which is now uncultivated<sup>15</sup>—appeals to Dante's own sense of the correctness of his explanation, with the words (*Purg.*, XVI, 103-108):

*Ben puoi veder che la mala condotta  
è la cagion che 'l mondo ha fatto reo,  
e non natura che 'n voi sia corrotta.  
Soleva Roma, che 'l buon mondo feo,  
due soli aver, che l'una e l'altra strada  
facean vedere, e del mondo e di Deo.*

The construction is natural, and the meaning plain, in the first of these two *terzine*: "Well canst thou see that evil leadership is the cause

12. See list in my article "The Three Goddesses," *MLN*, xxxix (1924), 339; to which may be added, among others: "*lupo*," *Inf.*, vii, 8, referring to the masc. "*Pluto*," though in *Inf.*, i, 49, we have "*lupa*"—the normal symbol, which happens (?) to harmonize in gender with the feminine abstract nouns *avarizia*, *cupidigia*, etc.

13. *Purg.*, xvi, 85-87: "Esce di mano a lui che la vagheggia / prima che sia, a guisa di fanciulla / che piangendo e ridendo pargoleggia, / l'anima semplicità che sa nulla."

14. As Pietrobono noted; though he did not touch on my line of reasoning, as here given. The reference is xvii, 5-6.

15. *Purg.*, xvi, 47 f.: "del mondo seppi e equal valore amai / al quale ha or ciascun disteso l'arco."

that has made the world bad, and it is not that nature in you is corrupt." The next verse is regularly interpreted: "Rome, that made the good world, was wont . . ." etc.; that is, "Rome, that made the world good, was wont"; and the rest of the passage continues smoothly: "to have two suns, that made visible the two roads, both that of the world and that of God."

This understanding of the clause "*che 'l buon mondo feo*" requires a severe strain on the normal mode of expression; and the infelicity hardly seems satisfactorily obviated by the usual explanation, namely: that it means 'Rome, which at the time of Augustus brought about that lull of universal peace that marked the time of Christ's birth, and thus made humanly possible the divine plan of her double sway, for Man's weal, which continued to guide him aright in the early centuries before the Church became corrupt and the Empire lapsed—that Rome used to have two suns . . .' and so forth. Dante does indeed emphasize this concept over and over again,<sup>16</sup> and I have no doubt that the general idea was present in his mind as he wrote these verses; but I should like to submit an alternative interpretation which I think quite possibly to be nearer to his intention, and to be deserving of serious consideration. Why not make "*che*," in vs. 106, the *object* of the verb, and understand "*il buon mondo*" to mean *Heaven*? It is no more, in fact it is less, strain to speak of Heaven as having "made Rome" than of Rome as having "made the good world": Dante constantly teaches that the founding and the location of Rome were planned and determined by God's Providence, working through Nature—that is, the nine revolving *heavens* with their influences.<sup>17</sup> Heaven is not elsewhere called by Dante, so far as I am aware, by the precise phrase "*buon mondo*"; but in *Par.*, xxv, 139, he calls it the "*mondo felice*"; and in our passage the epithet

16. Especially in *Mon.*, I, xvi, 1 f.; *Conv.*, IV, v, 3-9; *Epist.*, v, 26-30; *Par.*, vi, 80 f.

17. E.g.: *Inf.*, II, 20-24: [Aeneas] "fu dell'alma *Roma* e di suo impero / nell'empireo ciel per padre eletto: / *la quale* e 'l quale, a voler dir lo vero, / fu stabilita per lo loco santo / u' siede il successor del maggior Piero." *Conv.*, IV, v, 4: ". . . ordinato fu per lo divino provvedimento quello popolo e *quella cittade* . . . , cioè la gloriosa *Roma*." *Ibid.*, 20: "Per che più chiedere non si dee, a vedere che special processo, da Dio pensato e ordinato, fosse quello de la *santa cittade*. Certo di ferma sono opinione che le pietre che nelle mura sue stanno siano degne di reverenzia, e lo suolo dov' ella siede sia degno oltre quello che per li uomini è predicato e approvato." *Mon.*, II, vi, 1: ". . . natura enim in providendo non deficit ab hominis providentia." *Ibid.*, 7 f.: ". . . quidam non solum singulares homines, quin etiam populi, apti nati sunt ad principiari . . . (8) . . . non dubium est quin *natura* locum et gentem disposuerit in mundo ad universaliter principandum. . . . Quis autem fuerit locus et que gens . . . , satis est manifestum quod fuerit *Roma* et cives eius, sive populus." The concept of the heavens being the divine agents for Rome's establishment fits well, too, with the reference to "*natura*" in *Purg.*, XVI, 105; and at the same time leads up nicely to the astronomical metaphor of the "*due soli*" in vs. 107 of the same passage.

"buono" makes a nice contrast to the adjective "reo" which is coupled with the same noun "mondo." If it be read aloud, with distinctive stress on the "buono," and following the context beginning with verse 103, I think the suggested interpretation will be found rather appealing. The word *mondo* is used no less than seven times in this canto of *Purgatory*; five times<sup>18</sup> it is used unmodified, in its ordinary sense of this world, but once,<sup>19</sup> only twenty-odd verses earlier than our "buon mondo," it is qualified by the adjective "presente": which shows a definite consciousness of the contrast with that Better World, whose plans for the right conduct of weak mortals are being so sadly thwarted by heedless and corrupt leaders. "Evil leadership is the cause that has made the world bad, and it is not that nature in you is corrupt. Rome, that the *Good* World made, used to have two suns, that made visible the two roads, both that of the world and that of God."<sup>20</sup>

H. D. AUSTIN

*University of Southern California*

18. Vss. 47, 58, 66, 104, 108.

19. Vs. 82.

20. To the Biblical parallels usually quoted to Dante's use of the metaphor of the widow, in *Purg.*, VI, 112-114 ("Vieni a veder la tua Roma che piagne / vedova e sola, e di e notte chiama: / 'Cesare mio, perchè non m'accompagne?'" ) may be added *IV Esdras*, II, 2-4, in a chapter on the "Synagoga sub figura matris": "Mater, quae eos generavit, dicit illis: Ite, filii, quia ego vidua sum, et derelicta. (3) Educavi vos cum laetitia, et amisi vos cum luctu, et tristitia, quoniam peccastis coram Domino Deo vestro, et quod malum est coram eo fecistis. (4) Modo autem quid faciam vobis? ego vidua sum, et derelicta: ite, filii, et petite a Domino misericordiam."

---

## THE CRITERIA OF LATIN PALEOGRAPHY IN THE STUDY OF ANGLO-NORMAN DOCUMENTS

---

THE STUDY of Anglo-Norman language and literature has had a varied career. For a century the existence of such a distinctive dialect has been recognized. In the first half of this period there was no critical study of linguistic problems, but in the past half-century interest in this peripheral dialect has increased along more scientific lines, and a considerable proportion of the documents have been edited. So much indeed has been published that students of linguistics have felt justified in assuming that the basic characteristics of the language at the various periods of its development were firmly established. But would it not be salutary if, before proceeding further on these assumptions, we were to consider whether the foundation of the linguistic structure is accurately laid?

When the student who is familiar with the scripts *qua* scripts of English-trained copyists of the later middle ages examines the MSS and editions which philologists in the Anglo-Norman field have published, he is immediately struck by the insouciance of these scholars concerning the age and provenance of the MSS which they describe and transcribe. This insouciance is particularly shocking in view of the importance these same scholars have attached to orthography as it in turn bore upon questions of accentuation and versification. Great care has been taken to show the process of diphthongization or monophthongization, diaeresis or syneresis, elision, the modification or effacement of consonants—always with emphasis on development from an assumed earlier orthography to a later. Now time is one of the essential features of development. Yet in the vast majority of these studies the student will look in vain for an adequately conscious and accurate connection between chronology and locality on the one hand and orthography and morphology on the other, a connection, that is, that takes account of the knowable factors in a given case. Put more succinctly, it seems to me that Anglo-Norman philologists have been very serious about theories of development, but very casual about the factual bases for these theories. This is a grave indictment, but, speaking *sub correctione matris ecclesiae*, as medieval heretics were wont to do, I should like to explain why I think it a just one.

In almost all cases, strictly linguistic studies have been based on printed works. Vising's *Etudes sur le dialecte anglo-normand du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (1882), and his *Sur la versification anglo-normande* (1884), Menger's *Anglo-Norman Dialect* (1904), Tanquerey's *L'Evolution du verbe en anglo-français* (1915) and numerous German monographs might be listed as of this sort. These scholars mention MSS. But it is usually clear that they quote from editions in the Rolls Series, Surtees Society, the Caxton Society or editions by Thomas Wright or Francisque Michel—all notorious for their inaccuracy, both linguistic and paleographical. Behind these printed editions and the authority that the printed word naturally gives lie further casualness and ignorance. Here and there the reading makes unmitigated nonsense, and non-existent words have found their way into the glossaries with disastrous results for the science of etymology. Furthermore, the dating of the MSS used for the editions leaves much to be desired. A qualified paleographer would either reject most of the datings intended to be close, or demand that the vague ascriptions to a certain century be made more precise. Often when the later philologist remarks upon the errors of the medieval copyist we may wonder if the misunderstanding has not arisen from the caprice, carelessness or ignorance of the nineteenth-century editor who has emended where he could not read, or neglected to give all variants of the MSS he was using. Specific cases without number could be given. I will use Tanquerey as a simple and relatively late (1915) example. In his *Evolution du verbe en anglo-français* he lists in chronological order (pages xi-xviii) the works on which he bases his study. He places Elie of Winchester's *Distiques de Caton* at ca. 1150. Only two MSS of this work were known to the editors: St. John's Coll., Oxford, 178 and Corpus Christi Coll., Cambridge, 405. The St. John's MS must be dated ca. 1225, the Cambridge MS ca. 1275. As a plain matter of fact we do not have in this case morphology of the middle of the twelfth century, but, at the earliest, that of the first quarter of the thirteenth. I shall return to this in another connection.

Again, Tanquerey uses *La Plainte d'amour* from Vising's edition with Vising's date, 1310-1315. The *Plainte* exists in five MSS of which one certainly, and perhaps two, antedate 1310: B. M. Harley 273, which Ward assigns to ca. 1300, though I should be happier to place it in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, and Rawlinson Poetry 241 in the Bodleian Library, which is to be dated with complete confidence ca. 1275. Tanquerey dates Grosseteste's *Chateau d'amour* 1230? and used Cooke's edition (1852) which, though based on two fairly old and good MSS, is almost ludicrous in the totality of its misreadings. Again,



Tanqueray uses *Proverbes de bon enseignement* which he dates ca. 1330. The work is found in numerous MSS, of which at least two considerably antedate ca. 1330: B. M. Royal 8. E. xvii must be dated ca. 1300 and Rawlinson Poetry 241 ca. 1275. Examples of this sort of confusion could be multiplied many times. It is small wonder that Tanqueray's book on the evolution of the Anglo-French verb runs to 868 pages. The effort to make a consistent and reasonable system of development with data of that sort is no mean one. I am quite unable to say if he has been able to bend chronology to his system, but if so it is no inconsiderable achievement.

The question will be raised—and with complete justice: by what authority do I disagree with datings of MSS so generally accepted? I should like to present a few observations which seem to me almost axiomatic.

1. As we are dealing with handwriting as an important datum in our general assembly of related facts, we must consider factors of educational psychology which are fundamental to our problem. What alphabet and what grammar did those boys learn who later turned out to be professional scribes? They learned to write Latin by severe drill. Schools were organized on that basis. Grammar school meant Latin Grammar School. It is true that the young of the upper classes learned to speak and read French early, but even in this case the formal instruction from the very beginning was basically Latin. If this is true—and I am aware of no data to contradict it—the formalized Latin scripts tell us the period and section in which the scribe was trained. A statistical demonstration of this predominance of Latin as a written language may be found in the relative amounts of Latin and Anglo-Norman writing extant. There are extant today roughly 50,000 MSS in Latin written by English scribes between the end of the eleventh and the end of the fifteenth centuries. Vising, in his most useful manual,<sup>1</sup> lists 419 MSS which contain works in Anglo-Norman. The vast majority of these 419 (which, through the addition of MSS unknown to Vising, could be increased to at least 450) contain only a few short items—prayers, extracts or marginalia—in Anglo-Norman. Most of these MSS are largely Latin. It is conservative to estimate that there was at least a thousand times as much Latin committed to writing in this period as Anglo-Norman. Now as to exact dating of these MSS. Vising lists only about 10 that are actually dated in the MS by the scribe. A few more can be dated within less than five years by internal evidence. All the rest, over

1. *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*, London, 1923.



96%, are dated on paleographical evidence only.<sup>2</sup> The paleographer dates and places a MS by careful observation and comparison of other MSS that are dated, but a dozen or so MSS cannot be more than a beginning. Against a dozen dated MSS in Anglo-Norman, we have hundreds of dated Latin MSS. To restrict oneself to a dozen dated MSS is to proceed on an unnecessarily insecure basis, and leads to the serious mistakes of which a few examples have been cited. It may safely be asserted, I believe, that almost all the scholars in the field of Anglo-Norman language would admit that they have not mastered the fundamentals of Latin paleography as that scientific art may be applied to MSS of English provenance of the later middle ages. This seems a grave oversight in view of the fact that the scribe who transcribed these Anglo-Norman items almost surely wrote much more Latin in his lifetime than Anglo-Norman. A judgment of date based on Anglo-Norman MSS alone cannot compare for reliability with one based on Latin paleographical criteria.

2. Anglo-Norman lacked the sacrosanctity of Latin. Very seldom did a scribe dare to change a Latin text, biblical, patristic, scholastic or even scientific. It was his pride to reproduce as accurately as possible his archetype. There were, it is true, ignorant scribes who misread the abbreviations, but abbreviations were often individual and puzzling. Yet the fact remained that the scribe's task was to copy the *ipsissima verba* of his text. But it was quite different with the vernacular. The scribe wrote, not graphically, on a basis of a morphology and syntax which had been drilled into him from his boyhood, but phonetically or semi-phonetically, according to his own construction of the sound. He took this liberty of writing semi-phonetically precisely because he had not learned his French from set and universally recognized grammar books. There was no real French equivalent, much less an Anglo-Norman equivalent, of Donatus or Priscian. He wrote the vernacular from hearing and speaking it. If he thought his archetype was wrong, and evidently this was a chronic condition, he changed the reading. His archetype may have had *qui*; he rejected that as not representing the true sound—in Latin it would have spelled *kwi*—and wrote *ki*. His archetype may have had *poez*; he rejected it, perhaps indignantly, and

2. The majority of datings given are unreliable; e.g. B.M. Addit. 22283 is dated 'XIII', whereas it cannot have been written before the end of the fourteenth century. Many MSS dated 'XIV' are clearly to be placed in the middle of the thirteenth; e.g. B.M. Addit. 5762, Harley 4971 (*div. man.*), C.C.C. Ox. 232, Rawl. Poet. 241 (ca. 1275), Camb. Univ. Lib. Mn. 6.15, C.C.C. Camb. 150 (ca. 1260), B.M. Cott. Vitell. C. VIII, etc. I understand Miss Ruth J. Dean is undertaking a revision of Visling's Manual.

wrote *povez*<sup>3</sup> as he knew all gentlefolk pronounced it. He diphthongized when he thought right, added or dropped syllables as his ear dictated. The most direct consequence of this violability of Anglo-Norman is that we are almost always at a loss to know what the original author wrote. From one point of view this lack of sacrosanctity of Anglo-Norman is more valuable than servile or scrupulously exact copying, but only if we know when and—so far as possible—where the copyist wrote or learned to write. This can be determined only by paleography. To build a system solely on morphological hypotheses is dangerous, particularly when we find the same scribe violating all this schema within a few lines by writing the same word in three or four different ways with complete equanimity.

The effort to make uniform what is not uniform and to schematize what is not in its nature schematic has little to commend it. "Editing" the text, changing to fit a preconceived verse scheme, or choosing the variant that suits us would seem only to add unnecessary confusion to simple variety. This has already been done so often that the careful reader might justifiably become exasperated at the general unreliability of a great number of published Anglo-Norman texts. Each MS copy should be regarded, from the point of view of language, as a new work, until its close connection with another copy of the same work is clearly and unmistakably demonstrated. This conclusion might even with great justice be extended to include any works written by an Anglo-Norman scribe. It is quite reasonable to assert that the Oxford copy of the *Chanson de Roland* (Digby 23) is an Anglo-Norman document. By the same token, the work of an Anglo-Norman author copied by a Picard or Francien scribe is likely to cease to be, from the point of view of language, Anglo-Norman. To illustrate this great independence of Anglo-Norman scribes, let us take the case of Grosseteste's *Chateau d'amour*, edited by Miss Jessie Murray as a Paris doctoral dissertation (1918). In line 1, which is sufficient for our present purposes, there are 23 variants in known MSS which she has not noted. The 16 MSS are of different ages, from the middle of the thirteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century, all but one the work of English scribes. The line in her edition reads *Ki bien pense bien poet dire*. The oldest MS has *Ky* and *puet*. She notices neither. Five other MSS have *Ky*.<sup>4</sup> Six thirteenth-

3. Whether the scribe added a labial or a dental *w* is of no moment in this case. The important thing is that he changed the spelling.

4. It will not do to say that the scribe made no distinction between *Ky* and *Ki*. Some Anglo-Norman scribes were very conscientious about using *Ky*, and it hardly ever appears in continental MSS.

century MSS have *puet*, *peut* or *put*. None is noticed. Only one thirteenth-century MS has *poet*, yet Miss Murray accepts that reading, and philologists would be led to assume that Grosseteste said *poet*. He may have, but we do not know that he did. No two of the 16 MSS agree in this one line. We do not know what Grosseteste wrote *ca.* 1230, because we do not have his autograph of this work. Our only knowledge of the Anglo-Norman of 1230 would come from MSS which are dated about that time either by the scribe or by carefully applied paleographical criteria. We do have a few autographs—Frère Angier in 1212 and 1214 and probably Pierre de Pecham or d'Abernun, 1267-68. Because, therefore, of the freedom scribes took in copying Anglo-Norman texts, we must consider each MS copy as a separate bit of linguistic evidence apart from the author's original text, and fit it into any developmental scheme according to its date, generally on paleographical evidence.

3. It may be objected that too much weight is here placed upon paleography, and too much reliance given to judgments of date arrived at by paleographical criteria. Aside from the fact that for over 96% of known MSS this is the only kind of real evidence we have, it must be pointed out that in dealing with MSS of English provenance we are particularly fortunate because of English isolation. Unlike the Ile de France, other French and Italian centers of learning and even Rhenish and South German centers, England was, comparatively speaking, unvisited by students from other countries. English scripts therefore are the most distinctive of all European hands. Their development was almost untouched by foreign influences and may be traced clearly and confidently from the late eleventh to the sixteenth century. In England there were no paleographical monstrosities such as were rife in all the continental countries. To the initiate even so calligraphic a script as the Gothic book-hand of *ca.* 1225 is immediately distinguishable from a similar hand of *ca.* 1275. Furthermore many of the more prominent *scriptoria* and centers of education favored certain distinctive characteristics. A Canterbury MS would not be confused with a Lincoln or Oxford product, and from the middle of the thirteenth century Cambridge students wrote both a different Gothic and a different cursive from that in favor at Oxford. The so-called chancery hand in England is still more distinctive and, because of the great number of dated documents extant, it is possible to date with great confidence within fifteen to twenty years and in some cases even more closely. It may be seen, therefore, why the simple assignment of a script to the thirteenth century, for example, is quite inadequate, mainly because it is possible to

break a century, in almost all cases, into three or four time divisions with justifiable assurance.

It is a truism that continental scholars notoriously misdate English MSS. Continental criteria do not apply. English scripts developed on their own lines. A few months' study does not suffice to qualify a continental paleographer, no matter how able and industrious, to pronounce upon the chronology of English MSS. Continental scholars studying in the Anglo-Norman field do not go about the task of dating English MSS from the only adequate *point de départ*, that is, Latin MSS written by English scribes. (Paul Meyer must be excepted from this broad indictment. He spent many years working in English libraries.) And unfortunately for this important aspect of Anglo-Norman studies, continental scholars have been more active than English and American workers. Let us call the roll of the better known names: Francisque Michel, Paul Meyer, Gaston Paris, Hermann Suchier, Johan Vising, Arthur Langförs, Haase, Bokemüller, Stimming, Goedicke, Neuhaus, Stengel, Oskar Dahms, Joseph Bédier, Mussafia, Söderhjelm, Koschwitz, Langstroff. Against that imposing array we may put Thomas Wright, F. J. Furnivall, T. D. Hardy, Paul Studer, Miss Pope, Miss Murray, and a few others who have edited scattered Anglo-Norman texts as sidelines, without pretension to specialized scholarship in that field.

The net result of this predominance of continental scholars dealing with MSS of English provenance is, in general, unreliable dating of the MSS, with increased confusion in any attempt to study the development of the Anglo-Norman language, so important as a peripheral dialect of French. In the study of literary sources the matter of chronology is of paramount importance. Even Paul Meyer, whose judgment of date was the best, of all continental scholars, after the appearance of the first of Dr. James' catalogues of Cambridge college MSS, relied on them, and these early catalogues showed only too patently the haste with which they were done. Meyer would have done much better to rely on his own judgment. A further and certainly not minor result of continental predominance in Anglo-Norman studies is the great amount of misreading of MS texts, because of the editors' unfamiliarity with letter formation of the English scribe. Stengel's much quoted work on Digby MS 86 is riddled with mistakes in reading.

An equally troublesome error is that of mistaken provenance, due to unfamiliarity on the part of the scholar with the peculiarities of English script. A case in point is the ascription by L. Brandin of Hannover MS IV. 578 to an Anglo-Norman scribe.<sup>5</sup> He says of one of the two hands

5. *R*, xxviii (1899), 489 ff.

in this MS of which he treats: "Elle présente les caractères de l'écriture anglo-normande." If he means by this that there is a script peculiar to those scribes who wrote in Anglo-Norman, it must be said that there is no such script. They were trained to write Latin, and wrote the vernacular in the same script they used when writing Latin. Brandin pays special attention to the "f longue" as determinative for the date which he assigns, 1266-1280. As a matter of fact, in both English and continental MSS this "f longue" can be found as early as the middle of the twelfth century and as late as the end of the fifteenth. Of itself it has no dating significance whatever. To judge from the reproduction in the article, the date assigned is acceptable, though a stronger case could be made for a later date, *ca.* 1300. Of the second of the two hands Brandin remarks: "c'est également une écriture anglo-normande." Neither of the two hands, however, is the work of an English-trained scribe, but rather of a Fleming or Brabançon. As soon as that is clear, morphological peculiarities which would be astonishing if the work were written by an English scribe become perfectly normal.

Let us sum up. An effort has been made to show that great and disturbing confusion has reigned in the study of the Anglo-Norman language and somewhat in its literature because of a disregard of the actual and ascertainable dates to be ascribed to MSS containing Anglo-Norman works. Order might be brought into this confusion if proper attention were paid to the unimpeachable evidence of Latin paleography. This evidence may be regarded as the soundest we have because: 1. Writing in Latin was more natural to the scribes, and they wrote more Latin than Anglo-Norman in the approximate proportion of a thousand to one. 2. They wrote Anglo-Norman at least semiphonetically, with almost complete lack of uniformity, and there is therefore no reliability to be attached to any given morphological variant *per se*. Their handwriting, on the other hand, was a constant. 3. We can date and locate English handwriting more exactly than the script of any other country because of English insularity and a consequently uninterrupted and relatively uninfluenced development. The paleographer of Latin scripts can be of vital assistance to the philologist and the historian of Anglo-Norman literature, and it is to be hoped that in the near future we shall see close and active coöperation between these two fields of scholarship.

S. HARRISON THOMSON

*University of Colorado*

---

## D'UNE CHANSON DU BAS-POITOU QUE RABELAIS A PU CONNAÎTRE

---

LES REMARQUABLES travaux accomplis, au cours de ces dernières années, en matière rabelaisienne établissent incontestablement que l'originalité du Maître est moins grande qu'on ne l'avait cru jusqu'alors. Son ingéniosité, en revanche, n'en prend que plus de relief quand on voit avec quelle habileté il a tiré parti de ce que le monde extérieur lui offrait. Souvenirs autobiographiques, événements politiques ou d'ordre simplement privé, lectures aussi vastes que fidèlement retenues, tels sont les éléments qui entrent, pour une part souvent considérable, dans la genèse de *Gargantua* et de *Pantagruel*. Ainsi s'éclairent des chapitres qui, à première vue, sembleraient des hors-d'œuvre, ainsi s'explique, entre autres choses, la présence du *Tiers Livre* au milieu d'aventures dont il vient suspendre le cours. Grâce à la phalange d'érudits que M. Abel Lefranc a su grouper autour de lui, la réalité se fait jour derrière les fictions les plus brillantes. L'Abbaye de Thélème, elle-même, se voit contrainte de descendre sur terre. On aurait pu penser que ce "rêve d'un moine qui, dégoûté de l'esprit monachal et souffrant d'une discipline trop étroite, s' imagine que la condition première du bonheur serait dans la suppression de toute règle et de toute contrainte,"<sup>1</sup> cet "acte de foi dans la bonté de la nature humaine"<sup>2</sup> n'était qu'une improvisation surgie par génération spontanée d'un cerveau à la fois révolté et confiant. Il n'en est rien. Le pays de Thélème est en Chinonais, à deux lieues de la forêt du Port-Huault, et l'architecture de l'abbaye est toute pleine de ce que Rabelais avait pu admirer, au cours de ses randonnées à travers la France, dans les châteaux de Bonnivet, d'Amboise ou de Chantilly. L'opinion, sur ce point, est unanime. En revanche, je ne crois pas qu'on ait jamais pensé à découvrir si quelques-unes des règles d'une telle abbaye n'existaient pas déjà, complètes ou fragmentaires, dans les traditions populaires de cette région du Bas-Poitou où Rabelais fit son temps de moine, et dont il subit si fortement l'empreinte.

. . .

Les hasards d'une recherche du temps perdu m'ayant fait feuilleter des recueils de chansons des provinces de l'Ouest, il m'advint de re-

---

1. *Œuvres de François Rabelais*, édition critique, Paris, 1913, Introduction, p. cii.

2. *Ibid.*, p. ciii.



trouver dans l'ouvrage de Jérôme Bujeaud<sup>3</sup> un air à danser que, dans mon enfance vendéenne, j'entendais fréquemment chanter. C'est la chanson du *Canard blanc* dont Jérôme Bujeaud donne la version suivante:

*Derrière' chez nous y a-t-un étang,  
Je suis brune gaillardement,  
Où les canards allont baignant  
Gaillardement,  
Je suis brune,  
Gaillarde brune,  
Je suis brune gaillardement.*

*Le fils du roi vint en chassant,  
Je suis brune gaillardement,  
Il a tué mon canard blanc  
Gaillardement, etc.*

*Par les oreill' répand le sang,  
Je suis brune gaillardement  
Par les deux yeux l'or et l'argent  
Gaillardement, etc.*

*Que ferons-nous de cet argent?  
Je suis brune gaillardement  
Nous ferons bâtir un couvent  
Gaillardement, etc.*

*Tout' les bell' fill' iront dedans,  
Je suis brune gaillardement,  
Et les garçons de dix-huit ans  
Gaillardement, etc.*

Parfois, entre les couplets 2 et 3, on trouve la variante suivante:

*Le fils du roi est bien méchant,  
Je suis brune gaillardement,  
D'avoir tué mon canard blanc  
Gaillardement, etc.*

*Par son bec répand du froment,  
Je suis brune gaillardement,  
C'est la métüre des pauvres gens,  
Gaillardement, etc.*

*De pauvres gens l'y en a tant,  
Je suis brune gaillardement,  
Depuis Beauvoir jusqu'a Challans,  
Gaillardement, etc.*

Dans le premier volume de la revue de folk-lore intitulée *Mélusine*, cette chanson, après quelques variantes insignifiantes (*et dessous l'aile il rend le sang—et par le bec l'or et l'argent*), se termine ainsi:

*Que ferons-nous de tant d'argent?  
Nous mettrons nos fill' au couvent.*

*Nous mettrons nos fill' au couvent,  
Nous les marierons richement.*

---

3. *Chants et chansons populaires des provinces de l'Ouest, Poitou, Saintonge, Aunis et Angoumois, avec les airs originaux, recueillis et annotés par Jérôme Bujeaud*, 2 volumes, Niort, 1866, pp. 134-135. Lire, à propos de cet ouvrage, l'article de G. Paris, "De l'étude de la poésie populaire en France," *Revue Critique*, 22 mai 1866.

Nous les marierons richement  
A quelque brave négociant.

A quelque brave négociant  
Qu'aura des écus de fer blanc.

Qu'aura des écus de fer blanc  
Et nous des écus de six francs.

Pour cette version, que *Mélusine* donne comme originaire du Morbihan, le refrain est:

Ah, ma joliette,  
Croyez-vous que mon cœur vive d'amourettes?

Et le correspondant, qui signe E.R., ajoute en note: "Le refrain semble n'avoir aucun rapport avec la chanson."<sup>4</sup> Ce refrain ne figure pas parmi ceux que Jérôme Bujeaud énumère à la suite de sa version vendéenne et qui prouvent la popularité du *Canard blanc*:

Je me nomme divertissant,  
C'est moi qui divertis les filles,  
Je me nomme divertissant.

J'aimons bien les cotillons rouges,  
Encore mieux les cotillons bleus,  
Les cotillons roug', les cotillons bleus.

Toujours ma boule va roulant,  
Toujours ma boul' va roul', va roul',  
Toujours ma boule va roulant.

Passons la land' gaillardement,  
Passons la land' gaillard', gaillard'  
Passons la land' gaillardement.

C'est le vent qui va frétilant,  
C'est le vent qui va, qui frétille,  
C'est le vent qui va frétilant.

C'est ce dernier refrain, légèrement modifié, que connaissait Remy de Gourmont, comme on en peut juger dans son *Esthétique de la langue française*<sup>5</sup> où il reproduit une version du *Canard blanc*, symboliquement plus riche que la version vendéenne, mais où ne figure pas le seul couplet qui pour nous soit intéressant:

Mon père a fait faire un étang,  
C'est le vent qui va frivoltant,  
Il est petit, il n'est pas grand,  
C'est le vent qui vol', qui frivole,  
C'est le vent qui va frivoltant.

Trois canards blancs s'y vont baignant,  
Le fils du roi les va chassant. etc.

Le fils du roi les va chassant  
Avec un p'tit fusil d'argent. etc.

Il est petit, il n'est pas grand,  
Trois canards blancs s'y vont baignant,  
etc.

Avec un p'tit fusil d'argent  
Tira sur celui de devant. etc.

4. *Mélusine*, recueil de mythologie, littérature populaire, traditions et usages, publié par H. Gaidoz et E. Rolland, 11 volumes, Paris, Lib. Viaud, 1878-1912, 1, 459. Ces recueils, qui m'ont été communiqués par Mr. G. F. Drake, forment une mine de documents des plus précieuses pour toutes les questions de folk-lore.

5. Page 291. C'est à l'érudition de mon excellent collègue et ami, J.-A. Bédé que je dois la connaissance de cette version si suggestive.



*Tira sur celui de devant,  
Visa le noir, tua le blanc.  
etc.*

*D'avoir tué mon canard blanc.  
Après la plume vint le sang.  
etc.*

*Visa le noir, tua le blanc.  
O fils du roi, qu' tu es méchant!  
etc.*

*Après la plume vint le sang,  
Après le sang, l'or et l'argent.  
etc.*

*O fils du roi qu' tu es méchant  
D'avoir tué mon canard blanc.  
etc.*

*Après le sang, l'or et l'argent,  
Après le sang, l'or et l'argent.  
etc.*

Il ne saurait être question de déterminer le lieu de naissance de cette chanson. Comme l'explique très justement Jérôme Bujeaud: "la chanson, fille ailée de l'esprit, va vite; un fleuve, une colline, un changement de langage, de langue même, ne sauraient entraver son essor. A peine éclos elle vole, de voix en voix, par tous pays, cherchant les hommes dont elle allègera le travail, dissipera l'ennui, charmera le cœur et égaiera l'esprit."<sup>6</sup> Nous pouvons simplement affirmer que le *Canard blanc*, dans la première version que nous avons donnée, appartient au folk-lore de Vendée. Les seuls noms de Beauvoir et de Challans en sont une preuve suffisante.

Quelle en peut-être la date de naissance? C'est là un problème tout aussi insoluble. La forme en laquelle on la chante de nos jours ne saurait nous renseigner pas plus que la robe d'une femme ne pourrait nous en indiquer l'âge. Un fait, en revanche est certain, c'est qu'elle fut créée par le peuple et non par quelque bourgeois cultivé. Jérôme Bujeaud en donne les preuves suivantes:

a) La musique des chansons de "lettrés" n'est jamais dansante. Or, le *Canard blanc* est un air à danser, fort gai, où se combinent les rythmes ternaires et binaires. C'est une variété du branle poitevin, danse rustique qui, au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, s'exécutait sur un rythme à trois temps, mais qui, de nos jours, se danse sur un rythme à deux temps, à la manière des rondes, du vieux branle du Haut-Barois ou des "trioriz fredonnés" par lesquels les "Bretons balladins" imitaient les "alleures braves et gualantes" de Mélusine, la fée architecte dont le corps, comme chacun sait, se terminait "en andouille serpentine ou bien serpent andouillique."<sup>7</sup>

6. *Op. cit.*, Introduction, p. 3.

7. *Quart Livre*. Ch. xxxviii. Sur la danse au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle consulter le très curieux ouvrage de Thoinot-Arbeau (pseudonyme de Jehan Tabourot, oncle du seigneur des Accords): *Orchésographie et traité en forme de dialogue par lequel toutes personnes peuvent apprendre et pratiquer l'honnête exercice des danses*, Langres, 1588. Il existe une excellente traduction anglaise de ce traité par Cyril W. Beaumont, avec préface de Peter Warlock (Londres, 1925).

b) La langue et le style général du *Canard blanc* sont essentiellement populaires. Jérôme Bujeaud remarque avec raison que, lorsque le peuple des campagnes compose des chansons, il ne les compose jamais en patois. Chanter étant pour lui une évasion, une poussée de sublimation artistique, il emploie à cet effet une langue qui n'est point celle qu'il parle avec ses bêtes. "Il va au fond de sa mémoire fouiller péniblement et rechercher les mots, les expressions les plus délicates qu'il ait entendues . . . il se construit, en un mot, un langage poétique en dehors de son langage vulgaire."<sup>8</sup> Pour le lettré de village, au contraire, le patois a une saveur que le paysan ignore. A l'origine des œuvres en patois (égrillardes le plus souvent et parfois même obscènes) on trouve toujours le maire, l'instituteur, le curé ou le médecin. La fameuse comédie en patois saintongeais, *La Mérine à Nastasie*, a pour auteur le docteur Jean, et l'abbé Le Bayon écrivait en breton les pièces de son théâtre de Sainte-Anne-d'Auray.

Ce langage poétique qui sourd des âmes primitives est, du reste, beaucoup moins le résultat de "fouilles" et de "recherches" que l'expression spontanée d'un subconscient chargé. De là l'obscurité de certains poèmes populaires et leur allure parfois incohérente. De là aussi l'apparente chasteté de vocables qui perdent toute leur innocence dès qu'on en perce les intentions. "Des expressions qui semblent de terribles lieux communs, écrit Remy de Gourmont, reviennent avec insistance; il faut les comprendre. Dans la bouche des filles, mon cœur *volage*, mon cœur en *gage*, mon *avantage* etc., sont toujours un euphémisme pour un mot trop clair et devenu trop brutal, que le vieux français traitait avec moins de réserve." Et, plus loin, il ajoute: "D'ailleurs, presque tout ce qui, de la chanson populaire, arrive au jour, se compose de fragments informes, pleins de trous, de grossiers rafistolages; il n'y a, en langue française du moins, que très peu de ces ballades entièrement belles et sans bavures. Quelques-unes sont d'une étrange obscurité et l'on s'étonne que la mémoire les garde aussi fidèlement. En voici une de ce genre qui est fort agréable:"<sup>9</sup> Il cite alors *Le Canard blanc* dont la signification lui aurait semblé fort claire si les méthodes d'analyse freudienne lui avaient été connues. On y rencontre, en effet, tous les symboles familiers aux psychanalistes: l'étang et le petit fusil d'argent, symboles sexuels; le canard blanc, symbole de la virginité. La mention du sang se passe de commentaire. Dans la présence de l'or et de l'argent, nous retrouvons le beau réalisme des simples qui savent bien que la première faute est

8. *Op. cit.*, Introduction, p. 7.

9. *Esthétique de la langue française*, p. 290.

souvent, pour les belles pécheresses, le début d'une grande fortune. Ce n'est point en restant vertueux qu'on acquiert honneurs et richesses. Un seul vers est ambigu: *visa le noir, tua le blanc*. Et cette ambiguïté est des plus savoureuses. On ne nous a parlé, en effet, que de trois canards blancs. Aussi faut-il voir dans le mot *noir*, non pas un adjectif, mais le substantif que Larousse définit: "Centre de la cible marqué par un rond noir." Jeu d'associations d'idées d'autant plus naturel que dans la version vendéenne, certainement antérieure à celle de Gourmont avec son refrain maniéré du "vent qui frivole," la victime nous dit être "brune gaillardement."

Ainsi, la logique la plus stricte préside à la composition de cet air à danser dont on peut aisément écarter certaines variantes comme des interpolations sans valeur. Il n'y a point de doute que le couplet: *par le bec répand du froment . . .*, de nature nullement symbolique, et qui arrive, ainsi que disaient nos grands-pères, comme les cheveux sur la soupe, est le produit de quelque mécontent de village en qui soufflait déjà l'esprit de revendications sociales. On ne saurait en faire état dans une étude littéraire. Nous écartons également comme insipides les derniers couplets de la version bretonne, donnée dans *Mélusine*, avec l'alternative saugrenue entre le couvent et le brave négociant.

Tout autre est le couvent dont il est fait mention dans la version de Vendée. C'est un couvent où on réunirait les belles filles et les garçons de dix-huit ans. Nulle mention d'âge chez les filles, car, pour l'amour, il suffit qu'elles soient belles. Chez les garçons, en revanche, c'est la vigueur de la jeunesse qui importe beaucoup plus que les qualités esthétiques. Il n'est donc pas question de leur beauté. Nous voici bien près de deux des articles les plus importants de la règle des Thélémites: "Item, parce qu'en icelluy temps on ne mettoit en religion des femmes sinon celles qui estoient borgnes, boyteuses, bossues, laydes, défaictes, folles, insensées, maléficiées et tarées, ny les hommes, sinon catarrés, mal néz, niays et empesche de maison . . . feut ordonné que là ne seroient repceues sinon les belles, bien formées et bien naturées, et les beaux, bien forméz et bien naturéz. . . . Au reguard de l'eage légitime, les femmes y estoient repceues depuis dix jusques à quinze ans, les hommes depuis douze jusques à dix et huict."<sup>10</sup>

Doit-on conclure de là que l'idée d'une abbaye aussi libérale se trouvait déjà, à l'état embryonnaire, dans le folk-lore du Bas-Poitou d'où Rabelais l'aurait tirée pour, après l'avoir développée, complétée, la faire servir à ses fins satiriques? Rien ne permet de l'affirmer, mais tout

10. *Gargantua*, Ch. LII.

porte à croire que le "climat" en devait singulièrement encourager la germination. La révolte contre les couvents n'était pas l'apanage des esprits forts. Le plus souvent ces geôles refermaient leurs portes sur la jeune imprudente dont le canard blanc avait souffert quelque dommage. Les filles d'honneur de Catherine de Médicis en savaient elles-mêmes quelque chose quand la preuve de leurs inconséquences devenait par trop manifeste. D'autres fois, c'était par désespoir de ne pouvoir marier leurs filles que les parents les mettaient au couvent. Les chansons du Bas-Poitou, quelle que soit leur date, retentissent fréquemment de plaintes à ce sujet. Voici par exemple le début de *Ma fill' vous irez au couvent*:

*Ma fill' sans plus attendre—vous irez au couvent—Je suis lasse d'entendre—les choses que j'entends.—Vous irez dans les cloîtres.—C'est votre destinée—Là, vos amours, la belle,—Pourront bien se passer.*

Et la variante de l'Angoumois:

*Il était une religieuse—Fort amoureuse—Son père l'avait mise au couvent—Parc' qu'elle aimait trop son amant.<sup>11</sup>*

Plus triste était le cas des "maléficiées et tarées" comme on en peut juger par *Point de couvent je ne veux ma mère*, une des plus jolies chansons vendéennes, toute pleine de bon sens et de charmante ingénuité:

*Dans Paris l'on a fait faire—Deux ou trois petits couvents,—Mon père ainsi que ma mère—Veulent me mettre dedans.—Point de couvent je ne veux ma mère—C'est un amant qu'il me faut vraiment.*

*Mon père ainsi que ma mère—Veulent me mettre dedans.—Je les ai priés d'attendre—mais d'attendre encore un an.—Point de etc.*

*Je les ai priés d'attendre,—mais d'attendre encore un an.—Peut-être au bout de l'année,—trouverai-je un pauvre amant.—Point de etc.*

*Peut-être au bout de l'année,—trouverai-je un pauvre amant.—Je ne me ferai pas faute—de le prendre promptement.—Point de etc.*

*Je ne me ferai pas faute—de le prendre promptement.—Il vaut mieux conduire à vêpres—son mari et ses enfants,—Point de etc.*

*Il vaut mieux conduire à vêpres—son mari et ses enfants—que d'être dedans ces cloîtres—à faire les yeux doulents.—Point de etc.*

*Que d'être dedans ces cloîtres—à faire les yeux doulents;—à jeûner tout le carême—les quatre-temps et l'Avent;—Point de etc.*

*A jeûner tout le carême—les quatre-temps et l'Avent;—et coucher dessus la dure—tout le restant de son temps.—Point de etc.*

*Et coucher dessus la dure—tout le restant de son temps.—Serais-je pas plus heureuse—dans les bras de mon amant?—Point de etc.*

---

11. Jérôme Bujeaud, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-263.

*Serais-je pas plus heureuse—dans les bras de mon amant?—Il me conterait ses peines,—ses peines et ses tourments.—Point de etc.*

*Il me conterait ses peines,—ses peines et ses tourments;—je lui conteraï les miennes.—Ainsi passerait le temps.—Point de etc.*<sup>12</sup>

Ici, c'est bien une protestation toute rabelaisienne élevée au nom des lois naturelles qui veulent que la jeunesse soit (ou tout au moins se croie) libre de "jouir loyalement de son être, sans miracle et sans extravagance," ainsi que le recommandait Montaigne.

On sait que Rabelais tenait la musique en grande estime. Elle occupe une place importante dans l'éducation de Gargantua, et, au prologue du *Quart Livre*, on ne trouve pas moins de cinquante-huit noms de musiciens. En outre, dans le chapitre xxxiii bis du *Cinquième Livre*, dont l'authenticité ne fait pas de doute et qui, d'après le manuscrit de la Nationale, se trouvait "*servato in 4 libr. Panorgum ad Nuptias*," Rabelais énumère les titres de cent quatre-vingt airs à danser que la Roynie des Dames Lanternes fit jouer pour divertir ses hôtes. La chanson du *Canard blanc* n'y figure malheureusement pas, mais elle n'y serait pas déplacée car on peut relever deux titres: *La Gaillarde* et *Par trop je suis brunette* qui donnent au couplet "je suis brune, gaillarde brune," un certain brevet d'authenticité. Cette idée de la gaillardise devait, au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, être bien répandue pour qu'on en retrouve l'implication dans le nom même d'une danse dont la vogue n'eut d'égale que celle des branles, pavanés, bals et courantes. Quant aux brunes et brunettes, si c'est aux Sables d'Olonne que le type en est resté le plus justement célèbre, elles prédominent toujours dans toute la Vendée. Et c'est aux beaux muletiers d'Espagne qui fréquentaient les foires de Niort et de Fontenay qu'il faudrait remonter sans doute pour trouver l'origine de ces teints ibériques.

. . .

Nous nous trouvons donc en présence d'une chanson évidemment très ancienne, d'origine populaire et fort vivace encore dans la partie de la France qui a laissé le plus de traces dans l'œuvre de Rabelais. Seule la version vendéenne fait mention d'une abbaye mixte. Il n'y a pas de preuve que Rabelais l'ait connue. D'autre part, rien ne prouve qu'il l'ait ignorée. S'il l'avait entendue, elle avait tout pour lui plaire, car on y trouve, outre un mépris fort sage des choses fortuites, un refrain et une conclusion qui ne sont pas sans gaité d'esprit. Le fait qu'elle ne figure pas dans la liste des airs à danser ne prouve pas que Rabelais l'ignorât à l'époque où il conçut l'Abbaye de Thélème. Bien des années

12. Jérôme Bujeaud, *op. cit.* pp. 137-138.

avaient passé depuis le *Gargantua*. Du reste, le Maître prend soin de nous avertir que son énumération n'est point la somme de tout ce qu'il savait sur le sujet, car il ajoute: "Encore les veiz-je danser aux chansons de Poictou, dictes par un Fallot de Saint-Messant, or ung grand baislant de Partenay le Vieil. Notez, Beuveurs, que tout alloit de hait, et se faisoient bien valoir les gentilz Fallotz avecques leurs jambes de boys."<sup>13</sup>

MAURICE EDGAR COINDREAU

*Princeton University*

---

13. *Cinquième Livre*, Ch. xxxiii bis.

---

## A SOURCE OF IBRAHIM OU L'ILLUSTRE BASSA

---

*L'Histoire de Jean Louis Comte de Lavagne* occupies pages 843-1077 of the fifth book of the third part of *Ibrahim ou l'illustre Bassa*.<sup>1</sup> The story is narrated by Alphonse, a Genoese gentleman in exile at Constantinople, especially for the benefit of the Illustre Bassa himself, who, as a former resident of Genoa and because he had not long before made a short stay in that city, was especially interested in such a notable event as a conspiracy (it took place in 1547) which deeply affected the Genoese state.

In the preface to the novel the author writes: "il faut que j'avoue ici, de peur d'en être accusé, que l'Histoire du comte de Lavagne, que vous verrez dans mon livre, est en partie une paraphrase du Mascardi. Cette aventure s'estant trouvé dans le temps que je décrivais, je l'ai jugée trop belle pour ne la pas mettre, et trop bien écrite pour entreprendre de faire mieux. Ainsi ne regardez cet endroit que comme une version de ce fameux Italien." A comparison of the story as told by Alphonse in the novel with the text of Mascardi<sup>2</sup> speedily convinces the reader of the almost literal exactness of the words "paraphrase" and "version." A complete demonstration of this is unnecessary. Except in certain cases, which will be commented on later, the two texts are in close agreement with respect to the events mentioned and the terms used. A few examples will suffice.

The various characters make formal and eloquent speeches at the proper moment: the Count himself, his advisers, and—in Scudéry—his mother and his wife also. These speeches as reported in Mascardi are reproduced almost verbatim in *L'illustre Bassa*:

### MASCARDI

... perche il Re di Francia (nella pro-  
tettione di cui vi fidate) no ha si poco  
che fare, per le pretensioni al Reame di  
Napoli, & al Ducato di Milano, che

### SCUDÉRY

Le Roy de France en la protection de  
qui vous vous fiez, n'est pas si peu occupé  
pour les prétentions qu'il a sur le  
Royaume de Naples et sur le Duché de

1. Paris, A. de Sommaville, MDCXLI: Privilège, 1641 . . . "un livre intitulé *L'illustre Bassa* composé par le Sieur de Scudéry." 3 volumes, in-8; pp. 952, 635, 1081.

2. Agostino Mascardi, *La Congiura del Conte Gio. Luigi de' Fieschi*. In Milano, anno MDCXXIX, in-8, pp. 137.



quando voglia tumultuar di nuovo in Italia debbia voltarsi all'aiuto vostro con tutto il nerbo de' suoi esserciti, hoggi occupati in assicurar le frontiere de' suoi paesi. (pp. 50-51)

In che termini all'ora vi troverete? a qual parte senza rossore vi volgerete? esoso alla Nobiltà, che si troverà tradita da voi; deriso dal popolo, che schernirà le vostri arti cadute in sua utilità; abominabile alla Patria, c'haverà per cagion vostra perduta la libertà; nemico a Cesare sotto la cui protezione si mantien la Republica; diffidente al Re di Francia, che bramava l'intiera padronanza di Genova; in odio a tutto il Mondo, che ragionevolmente detesta i tradimenti. (p. 54)

Con queste voci magnifiche, e plausibili, quali animi e di Popolari, e di Nobili, e di Cittadini, e di forastieri, e di privati, e di Principi non armerà per l'estermio vostro? (p. 56)

These typical passages suffice to show the close resemblance between the orations which are placed by the two authors in the mouths of their characters. As a final exhibit of this sort, I quote from two narrative passages.

The conspirators had set the night of January 4 as the time to strike, but were induced by circumstances to shift to January 2. To divert suspicion, the Count, after making preparations, spends a good part of the day January 2 at the Doria palace.

Habitava Gio. Luigi in quella parte rilevata di Genova, che si nomina Carignano, luogo poco meno che diviso dal rimanente; perche confinando da più bande con le muraglie, da levante rimira le delitiose ville d'Albaro, e la valle amenissima del Bisagno: in faccia hà la marina, e dall'altezza del sito viene ad un certo modo separato dagli edifici inferiori della Città, a'quali par quasi signoreggi. In questo colle era l'antico palagio di Gio. Luigi edificato magnificamente.

Su'l far della notte introduce in casa

Milan, que quand même il voudrait de nouveau remuer en Italie, il vint vous secourir avec toutes ses forces, qui sont employées pour la sûreté de ses frontières. (pp. 901-902)

En quels termes vous trouverez-vous alors? De quel côté vous pourrez-vous tourner sans honte? Détesté des Nobles que vous avez trahis; méprisé du peuple qui se moquera des moyens qui auront causé son utilité et votre ruine; abominable à la patrie, comme lui ayant ravi la liberté; ennemi de César, comme protecteur de la République; suspect au Roi de France, qui désirait avoir un pouvoir absolu à Gênes; et en haine à tout le monde, qui naturellement et raisonnablement déteste les trahisons. (pp. 908-909)

Avec des reproches si justes, et un manifeste si plausible, qui sera-ce d'entre le peuple ou d'entre les Nobles, des citoyens ou des étrangers, des personnes privées ou des Princes, qui ne s'arme pour vous exterminer? (p. 911)

. . . il s'en alla à son palais, qui . . . était à cette partie de Gennes, qu'on appelle Carignan, et semble être détachée de tout le reste de la ville et lui commander tant par sa situation avantageuse, que par sa magnificence . . . ce palais étant bâti sur une colline, touchait presque de divers côtés les murailles de Gennes. La mer était en face du bâtiment et vers le Levant la vue de l'agréable vallée de Bisagno.

Enfin le Comte étant retourné chez lui, il fit venir au commencement de la



sua tutti quegli uomini armati, che gli facevano di bisogno, e pone in guardia delle porte i più valorosi e fedeli, che lasciassero libera a ciascuno l'entrata, ma non l'uscita. (p. 91)

nuit quantité d'hommes armés. . . Il mit à la garde des portes de son Palais, ceux qu'il crut les plus courageux et les plus fidèles, avec ordre d'en laisser l'entrée libre à tout le monde, mais de n'en laisser sortir personne. (pp. 980-981)

On the night set for the uprising, the Count has invited to his palace a number of young "Gentilhuomini dell'ordine popolare," who were astonished at what took place after their arrival.

Rimasero non poco attoniti quei Giovani veggendo l'insolito apparato di quella casa piena d'armi, e d'armati, e si guardavano l'un l'altro, quando Gio. Luigi tutto cangiato nel volto (non sò se per l'orrore del vicino parricidio, o per la rabbia contro di Giannettino, che fino all'ora violentemente repressa nel cuore cominciava a tentar per gli occhi, e per la bocca l'uscita) appoggiato ad una tavola ignuda, percotendola con la mano così parlò.

Così à, Giovani valorosi. Un'animo c'habbia punto di sangue ingenuo non può soffrirlo. Troppo dura violenza fanno a' miei costanti pensieri l'indignità di chi procura d'opprimerci; troppo acerbo spettacolo mi figura nell'animo il terrore della Patria cadente, e de' Cittadini tiranneggiati. Se i mali, che mortalmente affliggono la Republica potessero sperare qualche rimedio dal tempo, tollererei di buona voglia ogni indugio, che fosse giovevole alla salute commune: ma poiche le cose nostre son pervenute all'ultimo precipitio; è forza che ci facciamo incontro alle nostre ruine per sostenerle. . . (pp. 94-95)

Mais ils furent bien surpris lorsqu'ils le virent entrer armé de toutes pièces et suivi de plus de deux cents soldats. . . Il avait la visière haussée et l'épée à la main, et commençant lors de faire éclater la haine et la colère, qu'il avait si longtemps retenues cachées en son cœur, il avait le visage tout enflammé, et la fièreté et la fureur peintes dans les yeux. Il s'approcha d'une table, et s'y étant appuyé de la main gauche, il fut quelque temps sans rien dire, puis la frappant tout d'un coup avec violence, il dit d'un ton impérieux et d'une voix précipitée: C'en est fait, j'y suis résolu, ô courageux et illustres amis. Un esprit, touché de quelque générosité ne peut plus le souffrir: l'insolence de ceux qui nous veulent opprimer a irrité mon courage et lassé ma patience. Mon imagination me présente un spectacle trop horrible et trop funeste, en me faisant voir nos Citoyens tyrannisés, et le renversement de la Patrie indubitable. . . Si les maux dont la République est mortellement atteinte, pouvaient espérer quelques remèdes du temps, je souffrirais comme les autres, un retardement qui pourrait être utile au bien public. Mais puisque nous sommes arrivés au dernier point de notre malheur, que nous nous voyons tous prêts d'être abbatu, il faut de nécessité aller au devant de ce qui nous doit accabler. . . (pp. 986-988)

The Count continues his oration, which fills about seven pages in Mascardi and some fourteen of the smaller pages of the novel. The passages cited above are long enough to show the exceedingly close

resemblance between the two authors, and also to illustrate how the novelist, when the occasion demands it, stages a situation more dramatically and supplies more detail than the historian, as when he ushers the Count upon the stage in the passage just quoted. Mascardi is satisfied with the phrase: "Quella casa piena d'armi e d'armati"; whereas in the novel, the count withdraws for a short time and returns "armé de toutes pièces et suivi de plus de deux cents soldats avec des pertuisanes ou des mosquets qui se rangèrent à l'entour de lui."

The passages quoted, together with numerous others which could be cited, exemplify the novelist's exactness in formulating an acknowledgment of indebtedness to Mascardi. This point being admitted, it is of more interest to observe the changes that Scudéry made in adapting the narrative of the Italian historian to the purposes of a novelist. These modifications, aside from such cases as the one noted above in which the French author makes a change in the *mise-en-scène* in keeping with the type of composition, appear to be prompted chiefly by certain considerations which I shall now take up seriatim.

1. The story of the conspiracy is, as has been said, related by one of the characters to a group of friends as one of the several narratives interpolated in the novel. It must, therefore, be connected in some way with the frame in which it is placed. The hero of the novel, "L'Illustre Bassa" or Ibrahim, is, we are told, a member of the noted family of Justinian, a descendant of the emperor Constantin Paléologue. Genoa was his birthplace. Having been captured by the Turks, he had come to be the favorite and first minister of Soliman, but, despite his grandeur, he was wretched because of his separation from Isabelle, a princess of Monaco, with whom he was in love. The Sultan, very obligingly, has Isabelle abducted and brought to Constantinople in order that his premier may be easier in his mind. The princess finds there, also in captivity, a number of her friends from Genoa, and since they are Italians, they are presented to her by Soliman, who, very naturally, had himself fallen a victim to her charms and is torn between his love for Isabelle and his obligations toward Ibrahim. Upon recognizing her friends, two of whom belong to the Doria family, Isabelle wanted to know their story and to have news of the Count de Lavagne and his wife. Thereupon Alphonse, one of the captive Genoese, who had taken part in the conspiracy, relates the story, making of it at the same time a report of what had happened in Genoa and an explanation of how the group of friends there present, having taken flight by sea after the failure of the conspiracy and being swept out of their course by a storm,

landed in Morocco, whence they had come to Constantinople in a way which was to provide the matter for a subsequent narrative. Thus we have a situation in which one of a group of friends relates to others, who are totally uninformed, the startling news from home of a grave affair in which still another friend had been deeply involved and had come to a tragic end.

2. Since Alphonse is relating to friends a story involving another friend, the tone of the narrative is favorable to the chief personage.

3. As the narrative belongs to a novel, the love *motif* must naturally play a considerable *rôle*.

4. Owing to the fact that the narrative has been taken over from the Italian by a French author, any anti-French elements which may be present in the source would naturally tend to disappear from the story as retold.

5. The author of *Ibrahim* is concerned chiefly with the story as a story. Consequently, the historical background is more rapidly sketched in than in an historical narrative.

I shall now comment on each of the five items of this list.

1. The effects of the novelist's efforts to tie up the story of the conspiracy with the fortunes of the characters, present themselves almost automatically to the reader's notice. Prominent among these are the narrator's account of what he and his friends did during the fatal night, how they persuaded the Count's wife to take ship with them, how they learned certain details from eye-witnesses, and the remarks interjected by the captive princess, Isabelle (page 1044), to the effect that she now understands why there was so much uproar in the city on the night when she was abducted, which happened to be the night of the outbreak of the conspiracy. Until she heard the story told by Alphonse, she had thought that all the considerable disturbance which she had observed was connected in some way with her own unhappy adventure.

2. Owing to the favorable attitude of the narrator toward his friend, the Count de Lavagne, the novel departs considerably from Mascardi in characterizing the chief conspirator. The historian represents the Count as ambitious, turbulent, and eager to gain fame and higher rank. On the advice of friends, he reads diligently the life of Nero, the story of Cataline's conspiracy, Machiavelli's *Prince*. "Da questi libri senti pian piano instillarsi nell'animo la crudeltà, la perfidia, e l'amore del privato interesse sopra ogni ragione humana e divina . . ." (page 31). He listens to the persuasions of Cardinal Trivultio in behalf of the French king (pages 35-41) and consents "di voler assistere all'armi

Franzesi, per ridur Genova sotto il commando del Re, con alcune condizioni favorevoli alla sua propria grandezza" (page 44). He accepts without protest the proposal to slay the Dorias and their supporters in their own home (page 78). Mascardi mentions also the influence of the Count's mother "perche più ambiziosa che consigliata pungeva sovente l'animo del feroce figliuolo con amarissimi detti" (page 31).

Scudéry represents the count as harboring "un esprit impérieux et toujours rempli de quelque grand dessein" under an exterior "le plus doux, le plus civil, le plus galant" (page 845), and his ruling passions as "l'ambition et le désir de la gloire." His mother's rôle in his development is represented as of the first importance. She gave him a second tutor whose task it should be to mould his mind for ambitious plans. This educator "lui faisait souvent lire la conjuration de Catiline, la vie de Tibère et celle de Néron. Néanmoins comme les inclinations du Comte étaient trop vertueuses pour aimer les crimes, il ne suivait pas les avis de celui-ci" (page 848). But since he was also too ambitious to follow entirely the precepts of his more virtuous tutor, "il prenait un troisième chemin, et n'aimait rien tant à lire que la vie d'Alexandre et de César" (page 848), maintaining that the latter should not be called a tyrant, "puisque celui ne peut jamais l'être qui n'aspire à la souveraine puissance que pour en bien user" (page 848). The Count's mother is represented also as attempting to rouse him against the Doria family by contrasting the exalted place occupied by Andrea Doria's nephew, Jeannetin, with her son's situation (pages 872-874). She had taken care to coach the special tutor on this point: "Mais souvenez-vous de ne lui rien conseiller de violent, que vous ne puissiez prétexter du bien public . . . et de la gloire; car . . . si vous ne lui proposez que sa conservation, . . . l'avancement de sa fortune et la perte de ses ennemis, vous ne le vaincrez jamais" (page 877). Finally, she appears as the Count is taking leave of his wife just before the outbreak and, by her exhortations to action, counteracts the effect of his wife's pleas (pages 1014-1015).

To this nefarious influence, emphasis upon which serves to present the Count in a more favorable light than in Mascardi, is to be added also the influence of the evil counselors, Raphael Sacco and Baptiste Verrin, who are instructed by the Count's mother (pages 875-878) to follow up her exhortations by appropriate advice. He, "ne se doutant point de la trahison qu'on faisait à sa vertu" (page 879), received them cordially and accepted their point of view. Mascardi also makes use of this factor

as playing a *rôle* in the Count's conduct, but he does not (page 45 ff.) represent their bad advice as a direct consequence of the maternal commands and of collusion between the advisers.

Furthermore, Scudéry depicts the Count as animated by a rather commendable ambition for greatness and as being less of an agent for French diplomacy than in the original version (Mascardi, pages 103-104). Mascardi represents the Count as planning more deaths (page 71), than does Scudéry (page 941), who insists on the horror manifested by the Count when the plan to kill Andrea Doria is broached (pages 951-952)—a point not mentioned by Mascardi—and emphasizes also the arrogance of Doria's nephew and heir to power as an alleviating element in the Count's guilt (page 947). Finally, Mascardi represents the wife of the Count as condemning her husband's plan in no doubtful terms (pages 103-104), whereas in the novel, Leonora pleads with her husband only in the name of love (page 1011).

3. It was to be expected that love would be more prominent in the novel. Mascardi refers only twice to Leonora, the Count's wife. He tells in one sentence (page 93) who she was and devotes about one page (pages 103-104) to her last interview with her husband in which she vigorously condemns the plot. In the novel, about twenty pages (849-870) are devoted to the Count's courtship, to the rivalry between the Count and Jeannetin Doria, which is, of course, utilized as an element in the subsequent tension between the Count and the Doria family, and to the wedding. The farewell scene between the wife and the husband in the novel (pages 1107-1111) is much more elaborate than in the original text, and Leonora's rescue and her grief and lamentations after hearing of her husband's death (pages 1053-1059; 1066-1072) are given a prominent place. While the novelist does not promote the Count to the class of such devoted lovers as Ibrahim himself, and while Leonora is no more prominent in the main story than Brutus' wife in the plot against Caesar, nevertheless the love affair serves to prevent the story from contrasting too strongly with the rest of the novel,<sup>3</sup> and the element of rivalry in love between the Count and Jeannetin Doria contributes an element in motivating the Count's actions and, hence, in attenuating somewhat his guilt as a conspirator against the Doria régime.

4. I have already referred to the anti-French tone of Mascardi's narrative. He devotes a number of pages (11-23) to explaining how

3. The Count's farewell speech ends thus: "Quoi qu'il en soit, souvenez-vous qu'excepté la gloire, je n'ai rien plus aimé que vous. . . . Adieu . . . ou vous ne me verrez plus ou vous vous verrez dans Gennes au dessus de toutes les autres de votre sexe" (Pp. 1013-1015).

Andrea Doria, indignant at the failure of the French king to keep his promises, turned toward the emperor; he loses no occasion to interpret the Count's plot as part of the machinations of the French against the liberty of Genoa; and he rejoices in the final triumph of the Doria faction. The novelist ignores all this.

In a seventeenth-century translation of Mascardi,<sup>4</sup> of which the privilege is dated January 2, 1639, there is some evidence that Mascardi's anti-French attitude was generally recognized. In a communication addressed to the reader, the publisher of the translation felt it wise to explain that neither he nor the translator was responsible for the passages "qui peuvent donner le moindre ombrage aux plus zélés Français," and that he, the printer, had delayed publication in the hope of having the objectionable passages deleted, because the historian "étant né dans l'état de Gênes, qui est République, il avait des maximes qui choquaient celles des monarchies, et principalement de la Française." There is no reason for believing that this translation was used by the novelist. Indeed there is internal evidence to show that it played no part in the composition of the novel, but these remarks by the printer suggest a sensitiveness on the part of the French public which he felt obliged to take into account.

One cannot say that Scudéry makes direct propaganda for the French side of the case. Indeed, the novelist's conception of the Count de Lavagne as stimulated chiefly by his own proud nature and by his mother's urgings and machinations, tends to exalt his rôle as an individual and hence to minimize the play of outside forces.

By the unacceptable "maximes" reproduced in the French translation, the publisher of the translation probably meant such passages as those in which Mascardi expresses his satisfaction that "l'argent qui se consumait à entretenir les gens de guerre et contenter l'avidité insatiable des gouverneurs étrangers, fut lors [*i.e.* under the republic] plus utilement employé à la marchandise et au trafic" (page 2), and where he explains the vacillation and bad faith of the French court toward Doria: "Peut-être parce qu'étant comme enivrés et ensorcelés de l'opinion qu'ils [les Grands] ont de leur souveraine puissance, ils ne s'imaginent pas que leur fortune puisse avoir besoin de personne; ou parce que la présence diminue toujours de la réputation et du crédit des

4. *La Conjuración del Conde de Fiesque*, traduite de l'Italien du Sgr Mascardi, Par le Sr de Fontenai Ste Genevieve. Et dédiée A Monseigneur l'Eminentissime Cardinal Duc de Richelieu. Avec un recueil de vers à la louange de Son Eminence Ducale. A Paris, Chez Jean Camusat rue S. Jacques à la Toison d'or, MDCXXXIX.



hommes de marque" (page 14). Objectionable, no doubt, was the argument put forward against the conspiracy by Calcagno: "Et la ville irritée contre la tyrannie des Ducs de Milan et du Roi de France, abhorre et déteste le seul nom de la domination étrangère" (pages 64-65). Offensive perhaps, was Verrina's estimate of the value of French aid: "Car à quoi sert d'appeler au partage de votre gloire . . . les Français? lesquels ayant perdu tout ensemble et la réputation et les Etats qu'ils s'étaient acquis deça les Monts, sont si fort décheus de crédit, et ont le courage tellement ravalé depuis la prison du Roi François I, qu'ils tiennent encore dans leurs propres confins mal-assurés contre les armes de l'Empereur." Displeasing also must have been the estimate of French statesmanship, for while "ce grand Roi a des qualités véritablement royales . . . il se sert de conseil dans ses affaires plus importantes; et parce qu'il a profondément imprimé en son esprit une trop bonne opinion de la suffisance et de l'intégrité de ses ministres, il se laisse tellement mener à leurs artifices, qu'il n'y a jamais eu roi plus sujet aux tromperies de la cour" (page 91).

Scudéry (page 901) takes over quite faithfully the passage quoted above from the speech of Calcagno: "La ville encor toute troublée de la tyrannie du Duc de Milan et du gouvernement de France, déteste le seul nom de la domination étrangère." The first passage quoted from Verrina is, however, notably softened in the novel: "Car à quoi sert d'appeler les Français au partage de votre gloire? Au contraire cette nation ayant perdu son crédit en Italie, aussi bien que ses états, vous nuirait plus qu'elle ne vous y pourrait servir" (page 931). The novelist suppresses entirely the second passage quoted above from Verrina's discourse, no doubt as being too critical of a French monarch, and takes up the paraphrase about a page further on (Mascardi, p. 66; Scudéry, p. 931). The novelist retains, however, Mascardi's sonorous sentence: "Se ne stieno dunque nel lor reame i Franzese, e fin di là odano il suono delle vostre vittorie" (page 68), which is rendered thus: "Que les Français se tiennent donc en leur Royaume, et de là seulement entendent le bruit de vos victoires" (page 934).

On the whole, then, the novelist, while not departing essentially from Mascardi's handling of the references to France and to French influence, treads rather lightly on this ground, and, especially, attenuates the passages in Mascardi which are unfavorable to France and to monarchy. This tendency is all the more noteworthy in view of the fidelity with which Scudéry elsewhere follows the Italian text (cf. the whole of the two versions of the speech by Verrina). And when Scudéry

inserts elements for which there is no warrant in Mascardi, the passages are such as to sustain the novelist's general conception of the Count's character. The following passage, which has no counterpart in Mascardi, will serve as an example: "le Ciel me soit témoin, si je ne croyais rendre ma patrie plus heureuse sous ma domination, qu'elle ne l'est sous la tyrannie de ceux qui l'oppriment, si je n'aimerais pas mieux me résoudre à la mort, qu'à tenter ce que je m'en vais entreprendre" (page 940). Indeed, and very naturally, the novelist finds it somewhat difficult at times to harmonize his view of the Count's character with what actually took place. When the proposal to kill Doria in his palace is broached, Scudéry reports the Count as crying out indignantly against it. Mascardi says nothing on this score. But to the more nefarious plan, to invite Doria to the Count's house and kill him there, the Count assents. However, Scudéry, in order to make his acceptance seem less brutal, adds: "Le Comte trouvait le dessein assez bien conduit: il eut pourtant une extrême répugnance à se résoudre de violer le droit d'hospitalité, en assassinant chez lui des gens qui y seraient venus par ses ordres. Mais croyant qu'il ne trouverait pas un meilleur moyen pour arriver à sa fin, il s'y résolut" (pages 954-955). As an additional detail, it may be added that the novelist does not mention the Count's duplicity as reported by Mascardi in fondling the two sons of Jeannetin Doria in their father's presence just a short time before the hour set for the uprising and the killing to begin (Mascardi, p. 93). Finally, on this point, Scudéry passes over entirely the concluding passage in Mascardi's work (page 136) in which the historian enumerates eloquently the advantages of a republic and insists that the people of Genoa will unite to drive out any tyrannical governors.<sup>5</sup>

5. The novelist's concern is to tell a story. Hence we are not surprised at the summary fashion in which he disposes of the eighteen pages in which Mascardi traces the origins of the conspiracy, as well as of the fifteen pages in which the historian relates what took place after the Count's death and speculates on the probable brevity of the Fieschi rule had the conspiracy been successful. Nor, on the other hand, are we

5. "Perche quantunque il non participar degli honori della Republica . . . e l'essere sottoposti talhora all'insolenze di qualche Nobile poco discreto, possa parer gran male, se nondimeno si contrapone a gli utili, che si traggono dalla vita libera d'una Città di Republica, non è punto considerabile. Conciosiache non pur intieramente s'amministra la giustitia per tutti, e si puniscono i maltrattamenti usati da' Nobili contro qualunque persona, senza distintione d'ordine . . . ma ciascuno è sicuro padrone delle sue facoltà, ne hà la vita, o l'honore della sua casa in potere delle sfrenate voglie d'uno, che commandi con imperio assoluto." (Mascardi, p. 136.)



surprised at the detailed account given by the novelist of how the group of friends escaped from Genoa after the *débâcle*.

In a few cases, and for evident literary reasons, Scudéry departs from the sequence of events as recorded by Mascardi. One illustration is the reappearance in the novel of the Count's mother to urge him on to bold resolutions (page 1014), and again in the final scene after the failure of the enterprise—incidents which have no counterpart in Mascardi. But since, as La Calprenède remarked in his preface to *Cassandre*,<sup>6</sup> the historian does not expressly affirm the contrary, the novelist can not be accused of actually running counter to authority.

A second example is provided by the novelist's concern about the effect produced. Scudéry follows Mascardi faithfully in the narration of what took place the night of the outbreak up to the point where the Count, intent on winning over the port, attacks the flagship "la Capitana": "la quale per l'incompostomovimento della gente atterita lentamente ondeggiava. Salito dunque su'l ponte posticcio d'una semplice tavola, che posando per una parte su'l lito andava con l'altro capo ad appoggiarsi sopra la scaletta vicina alla poppa, nell'allontanarsi un tantino, che fece la galera ruinò egli insieme co'l ponte nell'onde" (page 108).

In the novel the action advances to the same point until we reach the sentence: "qui [la Capitane] par le mouvement subit et déréglé de ceux dont elle était remplie, flottait lentement et semblait se vouloir éloigner de terre" (page 1022). Then, instead of observing the sequence of events as given by Mascardi up to the Count's being precipitated into the water, Scudéry switches abruptly ("Mais durant que ces choses se passaient au port . . ."—page 1022) to the fortunes of the other groups of conspirators, to the state of confusion and apprehension prevalent in the city, to the murder of Jeannetin Doria, to the flight of André Doria, to the arrangements made by each party including a meeting of the Genoese Senate which appoints envoys to treat with the Count, and to the bewilderment among the conspirators caused by the continued absence of their leader. Fifteen pages further on the novel enumerates the respects in which the conspirators have achieved complete success: "enfin il ne fallait plus sinon que le Comte se montrât au peuple, pour en recevoir le serment de fidélité" (page 1037). Verrina, in despair at his leader's absence, begins to prepare for flight, which deprives his fellows of their master's first lieutenant. Success is at hand, but all crumbles when the Count's adherents learn of his death, which Scudéry reports

6. Vol. x, Part v, "Au lecteur."

at a moment of his own choosing (pages 1041-1042), but in almost the same terms as those used by Mascardi. By this rearrangement of the order of reporting events the novelist obtains clearly an effect of suspense and of greater dramatic intensity.

Another point of difference between the two authors lies in the fondness of Mascardi for "sentences," for moralizing comments on the events which he records. For example, his recital of the Count's death is followed by some ten lines beginning: "Così la provvidenza non errante di Dio si prende giuoco della stolta prudenza degl'infelici mortali . . ." (page 109). When Giannettino Doria fails to heed the warnings of a plot, the historian remarks: "Tanto caliginosa è la mente de' mortali, che all'ora altri a se stesso fabrica le sciagure, quando stima d'haver posta in sicuro la sua salvezza" (page 93). Other passages of this sort are frequent in Mascardi (e.g. pages 76, 78, 82), but there is hardly a trace of them in the novel, no doubt because of the story teller's feeling that they would be misplaced in such a composition.

Many more comparisons of detail could be made which would exemplify how the novel, because it is a novel, departs from a source which, in so many respects, it follows with great fidelity. But these should suffice to illustrate that the author was well aware of what was incumbent on a French novelist. No "rules" for the writing of fiction had been formulated comparable to those accepted for other *genres*, but it would be erroneous to assume, for this reason, that novelists of the period were unaware of their function or that they lacked skill to perform it.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, the introduction, into a novel dealing with the prime minister of the sultan of Turkey, of an historical account of a conspiracy in Genoa with which the hero of the novel had no direct connection, provides an excellent example of the "frame story" character of the seventeenth-century novel, which, in modern eyes, is one of its chief blemishes, whereas in the judgment of contemporaries these narratives were regarded as ornaments.<sup>8</sup>

ALGERNON COLEMAN

University of Chicago

7. Cf. Desmarets in the preface to *Rosane* (1639): "Les narrations, les descriptions, les discours de politique ou de morale, la vive representation des passions, les lettres, les harangues, doivent adroitement succeder les unes aux autres, et il n'y a point de genre d'escrire qui embrasse tant de matieres differentes." Cited by Magendie, *Le Roman français au dix-septième siècle*. Paris, 1932, p. 124.

8. "Garruca, pensant que Polexandre a hâte de savoir si Zelmatide a épousé Izatide, lui annonce tout de suite que ce mariage a eu lieu. Polexandre l'arrête aussitôt. 'Ne précipite pas ainsi mon plaisir, et fais-moi prendre goutte à goutte un breuvage.' Et il se plaint plusieurs fois que Garruca va trop vite; n'a-t-il pas escamoté 'un des plus beaux endroits, je veux dire la première entrevue du père et de la fille?'" *Ibid.*, p. 452.

---

## AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP IN THE FIELD OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ANGLO-FRENCH STUDIES<sup>1</sup>

---

IN THE study of the vogue and influence of English authors in eighteenth-century France American scholarship of the past generation has made notable contributions. Some scholars have investigated the various channels of infiltration (the critics, translators, and journals of the period), others have studied the vogue or influence of English authors, and a smaller number have attempted to lay the foundations necessary to all sound comparative study—the formation of an accurate bibliography of the field.

It is perhaps natural that students should have turned first to the study of intermediaries, for these offer a well-defined field of investigation and most have been relatively untouched. Among studies of French translators mention should be made first of Professor Dargan's thorough account of Ducis' versions of Shakespeare.<sup>2</sup> Among books the most notable since the dissertation on *Le Tourneur* by Mary G. Cushing<sup>3</sup> has been Miss Cobb's very useful study of *La Place*.<sup>4</sup> Bayle has received considerable attention, both as a forerunner of Voltaire and as a link with England. Howard Robinson's *Bayle the sceptic* (New York, 1931) is especially valuable for its discussion of the *Dictionnaire*, and admirably supplements the works of Fräulein Reesink,<sup>5</sup> M. Lacoste,<sup>6</sup> and Professor Horatio Smith.<sup>7</sup> Many new Bayle letters have been published, including several to English correspondents.<sup>8</sup> Another intermedi-

---

1. A paper read before the Anglo-French group of the Modern Language Association at Chicago (December, 1937). It does not consider Franco-English or Franco-American studies.

2. E. Preston Dargan, "Shakespeare and Ducis," *MP*, x (1912), 137-78.

3. *Pierre Le Tourneur*, New York, 1908.

4. Lillian Cobb, *Pierre-Antoine de La Place: sa vie et son œuvre (1707-1793)*, Paris, 1928.

5. H. J. Reesink, *L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709*, Paris, 1931.

6. E. Lacoste, *Bayle novelliste et critique littéraire*, Paris, 1930.

7. *The Literary Criticism of Pierre Bayle*, Albany, N.Y., 1912.

8. J. L. Gerig and G. L. Van Roosbroeck, "Unpublished Letters of Pierre Bayle," *RR*, xxii (1931), 210-217; xxiii (1932), 20-23, 117-128, 206-224, 312-320; xxiv (1933), 17-20, 210-222, 303-314; xxv (1934), 15-24, 341-360; Harcourt Brown, "Pierre Bayle and Natural Science," *RR*, xxv (1934), 361-367; L. P. Courtines, "Bayle and his English Correspondents: Four Unpublished Letters," *RR*, xxvii (1936), 104-109.

ary, Henry Justel, receives merited attention in the pages of Professor Harcourt Brown's excellent study of *Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth-Century France (1620-1680)*.<sup>9</sup> On the Abbé Le Blanc, Professor George R. Havens published an informative paper several years ago.<sup>10</sup> On the Abbé Prévost as critic of English literature Professor Havens's analysis of the *Pour et Contre*<sup>11</sup> has served as a model for succeeding dissertations. A valuable study of Prévost's translations of Richardson has been made by Frank H. Wilcox.<sup>12</sup> Professor Hazard's American students have also dealt in part with the relationship of Prévost to England.<sup>13</sup>

English literature as reflected in the *Mercure de France* is analyzed in Miss Lovering's dissertation.<sup>14</sup> Miss Miller has also studied the *Mercure* in the *Choix des anciens journaux*, and has published a part of her dissertation.<sup>15</sup> Grimm's opinion of English literature in his *Correspondance littéraire* has been profitably analyzed by Frederic Ewen,<sup>16</sup> while the *Mémoires littéraires de la Grande Bretagne* of Gibbon and Deyverdun have been similarly explored by Vernon Helming.<sup>17</sup> Berquin's adaptations from English periodical literature, principally the *Connoisseur* of Colman and Thornton, form the subject of an interesting article by J. M. Carrière.<sup>18</sup> Sorbière's account of his visit to England provides material for articles by A. Morize<sup>19</sup> and Vincent Guilloton.<sup>20</sup> The correspondence of Suard has been recently published by Professor

9. Baltimore, 1934. Mr. Brown also has an article on Justel in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, LXXXII (1933), 187-201.

10. George R. Havens, "The Abbé Le Blanc and English Literature," *MP*, XVIII (1920), 423-441.

11. *The Abbé Prévost and English Literature*, Princeton, 1921. Cf. also Mr. Havens's article, "The Abbé Prévost and Shakespeare," *MP*, XVII (1919), 177-198.

12. "Prévost's Translations of Richardson's Novels," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XII (1927), 341-411.

13. Paul Hazard et ses étudiants américains, *Études critiques sur Manon Lescaut*, Chicago, 1929, esp. pp. 85-99.

14. Stella Lovering, *L'Activité intellectuelle de l'Angleterre d'après l'ancien 'Mercure de France' (1672-1778)*, Paris, 1930.

15. Minnie M. Miller, "Science and Philosophy as Precursors of the English Influence in France: a Study of the *Choix des anciens journaux*," *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 856-896.

16. "Criticism of English literature in Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire*," *SP*, XXXIII (1936), 397-404.

17. "Edward Gibbon and Georges Deyverdun, Collaborators in the *Mémoires littéraires de la Grande Bretagne*," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 1028-1049.

18. "Berquin's Adaptations from English Periodical Literature," *PQ*, XIII (1934), 248-260.

19. "Samuel Sorbière (1610-1670) et son 'Voyage en Angleterre' (1664)," *RHL*, XIV (1907), 231-275.

20. "Autour de la *Relation* du voyage de Samuel Sorbière en Angleterre, 1663-1664," *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, XI (1930), 1-29.

Bonno,<sup>21</sup> as well as letters by Chastellux which throw light on the visit of Chastellux to England in 1768.<sup>22</sup> Boissy's *Français à Londres* has been treated by C. F. Zeek, Jr.<sup>23</sup> Miss Wood has described the contacts of English visitors with the French theatre of the eighteenth century,<sup>24</sup> and Professor Wade has described Destouches' visit to England.<sup>25</sup>

To the complex subject of Voltaire's indebtedness to English literature and philosophy American scholars have contributed a number of books and articles. Miss Florence White's study and edition of Voltaire's *Essay on Epic Poetry* is of first importance here.<sup>26</sup> Professor Dargan has summed up the results of several years' study and teaching in an article contributed to the *Mélanges . . . Baldensperger*.<sup>27</sup> Henry E. Haxo presents the case for Voltaire's indebtedness to Bayle rather than to English authors.<sup>28</sup> But the most original and far-reaching research has undoubtedly been that of Professors Havens and Torrey, in their investigation of Voltaire's private library at Leningrad.<sup>29</sup> From their first-hand study of Voltaire's books—many of them English—they have already indicated how fruitful a field has been opened.<sup>30</sup> Voltaire's reactions to English writers, and their influence on him, provide an almost inexhaustible field of research,<sup>31</sup> but the work of Professors

21. Gabriel Bonno, "Lettres inédites de Suard à Wilkes," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, xv (1932), 161-280; "Correspondance littéraire de Suard avec la margrave de Bayreuth," *ibid.*, xviii (1934), 141-234.

22. Gabriel Bonno, "Lettres inédites de Chastellux à Wilkes," *RLC*, xii (1932), 619-623.

23. "The Place of Boissy's *Français à Londres* in the Development of French Thought in the Eighteenth Century." This paper has not been published, but a summary may be found in *PMLA*, xxxii (1917), xlvii-xlviii.

24. Kathryn L. Wood, "The French Theatre in the XVIIIth century According to some Contemporary English Travellers," *RLC*, xii (1932), 601-618.

25. Ira O. Wade, "Destouches in England," *MP*, xxix (1931), 27-47.

26. Albany, N.Y., 1915.

27. E. Preston Dargan, "The Question of Voltaire's Primacy in Establishing the English Vogue," *Mélanges . . . Baldensperger*, Paris, 1930, I, 187-198.

28. "Pierre Bayle et Voltaire avant les *Lettres philosophiques*," *PMLA*, xlvi (1931), 461-497.

29. George R. Havens and Norman L. Torrey, "The Private Library of Voltaire at Leningrad," *PMLA*, xliii (1928), 990-1009; "Voltaire's Library," *Fortnightly Review*, cxxvi (1929), 397-405; "Voltaire's Books: a Selected List," *MP*, xxvii (1929), 1-22.

30. George R. Havens, "Voltaire's Marginal Comments upon Pope's *Essay on Man*," *MLN*, xliii (1928), 429-439; Norman L. Torrey, "Voltaire's English Notebook," *MP*, xxvi (1929), 307-325. On the notebook, which had already been fragmentarily published by F. Caussy in the *English Review* (1914), cf. also Florence D. White, "A Sentence from an English Notebook of Voltaire's," *MLN*, xxxi (1916), 369-371.

31. See, for example, Ira O. Wade, "A Favorite Metaphor of Voltaire," *RR*, xxvi (1935), 330-334 (an excellent comparative treatment of a theme), and Eugène Rovillain, "Sur le *Zadig* de Voltaire," *PMLA*, xliii (1928), 447-455. The editions of *Candide* by André Morize (Paris, 1931) and George R. Havens (New York, 1934) discuss the English

Havens and Torrey shows how necessary a first-hand study of Voltaire's reading is to any sound consideration of sources and influence.

On Diderot's connections with English literature the only book devoted to the subject has been R. Loyalty Cru's dissertation on *Diderot as a Disciple of English Thought*,<sup>32</sup> although Felix Vexler's *Studies in Diderot's Aesthetic Naturalism* (New York, 1922) is in part devoted to international aspects. Professor Van Roosbroeck's study of *Persian Letters before Montesquieu*<sup>33</sup> deals to some extent with English matters. Studies of Rousseau's relationship to England have treated his English visit,<sup>34</sup> his reading,<sup>35</sup> and his conception of the English character.<sup>36</sup> Of special interest is Professor Lovejoy's comparison of the ideas of Rousseau with those of Lord Monboddo.<sup>37</sup> Among the great intermediaries on whom work is still to be published are Jean Le Clerc,<sup>38</sup> Desfontaines, Fréron,<sup>39</sup> and La Harpe.<sup>40</sup>

Turning to actual studies of vogue and influence, one notes that American scholars have for the most part wisely refrained from speculation on influences and have contented themselves with studying the reputations of English authors in France. Until we know more accurately what English books were read and translated during the period, English "influences" remain hypothetical. The few attempts at such study have not been uniformly well received. M. Baldensperger's epithet of *beau sujet manqué* has been applicable too often, and the objections which M. Cazamian raised à propos of Carré's *Goethe en Angleterre*<sup>41</sup> con-

background of Voltaire's thought. Margaret S. Libby's *The Attitude of Voltaire to Magic and the Sciences*, New York, 1935, deals in part with Newton and other English scientists. Professor Torrey's *Voltaire and the English deists* is considered below.

32. New York, 1913 (cf. the review by G. Lanson in *RHL*, XXI (1914), 443-445).

33. New York, 1932. Cf. also his articles in *MLR*, XX (1925), 432-442, and in *RR*, XXIII (1932), 243-248.

34. A. Schinz, "La querelle Rousseau-Hume," *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, XVII (1926), 13-48 (with an appendix by F. A. Pottle, pp. 48-51); and especially Margaret H. Peoples, "La querelle Rousseau-Hume," *ibid.*, XVIII (1927-1928), 1-331.

35. Margaret Reichenburg, *Essai sur les lectures de Rousseau*, Philadelphia, 1932, and "La Bibliothèque de Jean-Jacques Rousseau," *Annales . . . Rousseau*, XXI (1932), 181-250.

36. George R. Havens, "The Sources of Rousseau's *Edouard Bomston*," *MP*, XVII (1919), 125-139 (comment by A. Schinz in *MLN*, XXXV (1920), 184-185, and reply by Havens, *ibid.*, pp. 375-376).

37. Arthur O. Lovejoy, "Monboddo and Rousseau," *MP*, XXX (1933), 275-296.

38. Miss Edith Phillips of Swarthmore College has completed an index of the contents of the various *Bibliothèques* of Le Clerc which will be very useful when published.

39. F. C. Green has an essay on Fréron in his *Eighteenth-Century France*, New York, 1929. There is an M.A. thesis on *Fréron's Année littéraire (1754-1766)* and *English Literature* (1923) by the present writer, in the University of Chicago library.

40. Miss Grace Sproull of Kent College has completed two dissertations on La Harpe, copies of which are in the University of Chicago library: *La Harpe as a Critic of English Literature* (1927), and *Jean-François de La Harpe, Controversialist and Critic* (1937).

41. L. Cazamian, "Goethe en Angleterre: quelques réflexions sur les problèmes d'influence," *Revue Germanique*, XII (1921), 371-378.



stantly recur. Successful work in this field can be done only by students thoroughly at home in the literatures of both countries, and by students who do not assume that foreign influences are the only ones measurable. One reason for the excellence of Professor Torrey's study of *Voltaire and the English Deists* (New Haven, 1930) is that the author commands a knowledge of both fields and that he does not assume that Voltaire derived all his deistic ideas from foreign sources. His book is a pleasant reminder that studies of influence can be successfully written if done with caution and discrimination.

A number of studies have been made of the French attitude toward English institutions and English writers. Miss Miller's recent article on "The English People as Portrayed in Certain French Journals, 1700-1760,"<sup>42</sup> shows how attractively such a subject can be handled. Miss Philips has studied the French attitudes toward the Quaker,<sup>43</sup> and Professor Bonno has written an excellent survey of the French opinions of the British constitution.<sup>44</sup> Professor Rowbotham has devoted a monograph to eighteenth-century discussions of inoculation, a subject with obvious Anglo-French bearings,<sup>45</sup> and Miss Hill has described the representation of Tudor monarchs in French drama.<sup>46</sup>

Limitations of space prevent a complete listing here of American books and articles devoted to the fortunes of English authors in eighteenth-century France. The most important general work is Prof. F. C. Green's *Mimuet: a Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century* (New York and London, 1935). His book, devoted to the three fields of drama, poetry, and fiction, furnishes a valuable corrective to the too facile generalizations sometimes made by *comparatistes* as to parallels between English and French literature and to supposed influences of English upon French works. To such subjects as Shakespeare's influence upon Voltaire, Thomson's influence upon Saint-Lambert's *Saisons*, and Sterne's influence upon Diderot, Professor Green devotes fresh appraisals which must be taken into

42. *MP*, XXXIV (1937), 365-367. The dissertation of Harry Kurz, *European Characters in French Drama of the Eighteenth Century*, New York, 1916, has a substantial section on the English character.

43. Edith Philips, "Le Personnage du Quaker sur la scène française," *RLC*, IX (1929), 432-446; "French Interest in Quakers before Voltaire," *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 238-255; "Le Quaker vu par Voltaire," *RHL*, XXXIX (1932), 161-177; and especially *The Good Quaker in French Legend*, Philadelphia, 1932.

44. Gabriel Bonno, *La Constitution britannique devant l'opinion française de Montesquieu à Bonaparte*, Paris, 1931.

45. Arnold H. Rowbotham, "The 'Philosophes' and the Propaganda for Inoculation of Smallpox in Eighteenth-Century France," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XVIII (1935), 265-290.

46. L. Alfreda Hill, *The Tudors in French Drama*, Baltimore, 1932.



account by all who are interested in Anglo-French studies. His criticism is directed not against the comparative method itself, the value of which, as he says, "has been amply proved by the works of its leading exponents," but against a too narrow and one-sided conception of research, by the student "who sets out upon his journey shackled to an *a priori* conviction" and who "is bound to return to us with an empty mind" (pages 463-464). His remarks on the "*Jones en France*" type of thesis should be pondered by all *comparatistes*.

Except for Professor Green, no one has attempted a re-examination of the complex question of Shakespeare and Voltaire since Lounsbury's book of a generation ago,<sup>47</sup> although articles by Babcock<sup>48</sup> and Stein<sup>49</sup> have described the English reaction to Voltaire's criticism. Studies devoted to the translators and critics of Shakespeare have been mentioned above.<sup>50</sup> Professor Van Roosbroeck has studied the very doubtful connection of Montfleury's *Trasibule* with *Hamlet*,<sup>51</sup> and Miss Gilman has shown how improbable it is that Destouches' *Dissipateur* was influenced by *Timon of Athens*.<sup>52</sup> Miss Gilman's most important work has been her thorough study of the French translations of *Othello*, from the eighteenth century to the present.<sup>53</sup>

The subject of Milton in France has attracted little attention, although Telleen's thesis<sup>54</sup> calls for obvious revision. Professor Wolfe's study of Milton's political ideas in revolutionary France is the only item to be noted.<sup>55</sup>

Except for two brief articles in connection with Voltaire,<sup>56</sup> Dryden's French reputation has likewise been neglected.<sup>57</sup>

47. T. R. Lounsbury, *Shakespeare and Voltaire*, New York, 1902.

48. R. W. Babcock, "The English Reaction against Voltaire's Criticism of Shakespeare," *SP*, xxvii (1930), 609-625.

49. J. M. Stein, "Horace Walpole and Shakespeare," *SP*, xxxi (1934), 51-68.

50. E. P. Dargan, "Shakespeare and Ducis," *MP*, x (1912), 137-178; Lillian Cobb, *La Place*, Paris, 1928; G. R. Havens, "The Abbé Prévost and Shakespeare," *MP*, xvii (1919), 177-198.

51. G. L. Van Roosbroeck, "Hamlet in France in 1663," *PMLA*, xxxvii (1922), 228-

242. H. Carrington Lancaster has pointed out a resemblance between *Henry V* and Hardy's *La Mort d'Achille*, *Todd Memorial Volumes*, New York, 1930, II, 3-6.

52. Margaret Gilman, "Le *Dissipateur* and *Timon of Athens*," *MLN*, xlii (1927), 162-165. For Shadwell's adaptation of the *Tempest* in France, cf. Alfred Iacuzzi, "The Naïve Theme in the *Tempest* . . .," *MLN*, lii (1937), 252-256.

53. *Othello in French*, Paris, 1925.

54. *Milton dans la littérature française*, Paris, 1904.

55. Don M. Wolfe, "Milton and Mirabeau," *PMLA*, xlix (1934), 1116-1128.

56. Donald C. Stuart, "The Sources of Two of Voltaire's 'Contes en vers,'" *MLR*, xii (1917), 177-181, and "A Note on Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques*," *MLN*, xxxii (1917), 179-180.

57. Miss Agnes Riddell of Wheaton College is engaged in a study of Dryden and Voltaire.

On English philosophy in France Professor Torrey's book on *Voltaire and the English Deists*, already mentioned, is the most important. On the French reputation of Hobbes Professor Morize has a suggestive article,<sup>58</sup> and F. B. Kaye dealt decisively with the influence of Mandeville both in France and in England, in an article in *Studies in Philology*.<sup>59</sup> Professor Morize's study of the *apologie du luxe*<sup>60</sup> also has bearings on Mandeville. Bolingbroke's supposed influence on Voltaire forms the subject of a rather severe article by Professor Torrey.<sup>61</sup> A recent article on the *Lettres persanes* points out similarities of opinion between Shaftesbury and Montesquieu but wisely avoids considering Shaftesbury's statements as sources, since the ideas in question are commonplace.<sup>62</sup>

Among studies of English drama in France, the most ambitious has been Professor Oliver's attempt to demonstrate Voltaire's borrowing from the *Mérope* of George Jeffreys.<sup>63</sup> Paul B. Anderson has pointed out a reflection of Otway's *Orphan* in Prévost.<sup>64</sup> G. W. Mead has traced the influence of Lillo in France.<sup>65</sup>

The French reputation of Addison and Steele offers a fruitful field for investigation, but so far little has been done on this subject. E. C. Baldwin has considered the influence of the *Spectator* on Marivaux.<sup>66</sup> The international aspects of the story told by Steele in *Spectator* #111 have been recently studied by Professor L. M. Price, and the results set forth in his attractive *Inkle and Yarico Album*.<sup>67</sup> This book, which shows how the theme is developed in characteristic ways in three countries—England, France, and Germany—, is a good example of comparative

58. A. Morize, "Th. Hobbes et Samuel Sorbière: notes sur l'introduction de Hobbes en France," *Revue Germanique*, IV (1908), 195-204.

59. "The Influence of Bernard Mandeville," *SP*, XIX (1922), 83-108. For Mandeville's possible influence on Condillac cf. Kaye's article, "Mandeville on the origin of language," *MLN*, XXXIX (1924), 136-142. Kaye's edition of the *Fable of the Bees* treats fully the French aspects of Mandeville's thought.

60. André Morize, *L'Apologie du luxe au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: "Le Mondain" et ses sources*, Paris, 1909.

61. "Bolingbroke and Voltaire—a Fictitious Influence," *PMLA*, XLII (1927), 788-797. For Voltaire's use of another deistic writer cf. Torrey's article, "Voltaire and Peter Annet's *Life of David*," *PMLA*, XLIII (1928), 836-843.

62. A. S. Crisafulli, "Parallels to Ideas in the *Lettres persanes*," *PMLA*, LII (1937), 773-777.

63. T. E. Oliver, *The Mérope of George Jeffreys as a Source of Voltaire's Mérope*, Urbana, Ill., 1928.

64. "English Drama Transferred to French Fiction," *MLN*, XLIX (1934), 178-180.

65. "Some Direct Influences of Lillo's *The London Merchant* in France before 1790," *Birmingham-Southern College Bulletin*, XXI (1928), 9-28.

66. "Marivaux's Place in the Development of Character Portrayal," *PMLA*, XXVII (1912), 168-187.

67. Berkeley, California, 1937.

scholarship, the work of a scholar who knows all three literatures. On other English prose writers there is not much to record. Miss Goulding left little for others to glean on the subject of Swift's French reputation, although C. M. Webster has pointed out two or three omissions,<sup>68</sup> and Professor Rovillain has noted a possible borrowing by Voltaire.<sup>69</sup> Lord Lyttelton's anticipations of Rousseau form the subject of an article by Professor Chew.<sup>70</sup>

On English poets Thomson has attracted most attention from students of Anglo-French relations. Miss Cameron's dissertation is a full study of the relationship of Thomson to Saint-Lambert and of Thomson's possible influence on other French nature poets.<sup>71</sup> The echoes of Thomson's political ideas have been described by Edward D. Seeber,<sup>72</sup> and Miss Rose M. Davis has investigated—and disposed of—the alleged connection of Thomson with Voltaire's *Socrate*.<sup>73</sup> The reputation of Pope in France forms the subject of an excellent monograph by Miss Jacqueline de la Harpe,<sup>74</sup> and Professor Havens, as noted above, has dealt with Voltaire's opinions of Pope, especially in regard to the question of optimism.<sup>75</sup> Of studies on the French reputations of other poets mention may be made of articles by J. M. Carrière<sup>76</sup> and Eugène Rovillain.<sup>77</sup>

On the novelists two recent books deserve the attention of all students of the period. H. W. Streeter's study of French translations of eighteenth-century English novels<sup>78</sup> gives a good résumé of the subject: especially informative are his discussions of Fielding and Richardson in France. Professor Joliat's book on Smollett<sup>79</sup> is perhaps the most successful of all American studies of this type: his analysis of the French attitudes toward Smollett the historian as well as Smollett the

68. "Omissions from *Swift en France*," *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 152-153.

69. Eugène Rovillain, "Sur le *Zadig* de Voltaire," *PMLA*, XLIII (1928), 451-453.

70. S. C. Chew, "An English Precursor of Rousseau," *MLN*, XXXII (1917), 321-337.

71. Margaret M. Cameron, *L'Influence des "Saisons" de Thomson sur la poésie descriptive en France de 1759 à 1810*, Paris, 1927. Prof. Hunter Wright's study of this subject is summarized in *PMLA*, XXX (1915), xxx.

72. "Anti-slavery Opinion in the Poems of some Early French Followers of James Thomson," *MLN*, L (1935), 427-434.

73. "Thomson and Voltaire's *Socrate*," *PMLA*, XLIX (1934), 560-565.

74. "Le *Journal des savants* et la renommée de Pope en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XVI (1933), 173-216.

75. G. R. Havens, "Voltaire's Marginal Comments upon Pope's *Essay on Man*," *MLN*, XLIII (1928), 429-439.

76. "Notes on Arnaud Berquin's Adaptations from English Poetry," *RR*, XXVI (1933), 335-340 (Goldsmith's "Hermit," and one of the ballads in Percy's *Reliques*).

77. "L. S. Mercier et l'*Elegy* de Gray," *MLN*, XLIII (1928), 442-445.

78. *The Eighteenth-Century English Novel in French Translation: a Bibliographical Study*, New York, 1936.

79. *Smollett et la France*, Paris, 1935.

novelist is done with penetration and care. On the vexed question of Richardson in France there is little to note, except Dr. Streeter's survey. Too many, as Professor Green says, are tempted to regard Texte's pioneering thesis as a *dictionnaire d'idées reçues*.<sup>80</sup> On Sterne we may note chiefly Prof. F. B. Barton's *Etude sur l'influence de Sterne en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1911).<sup>81</sup> Fielding still awaits study. The fortunes of Mrs. Behn's *Oroonoko* in France have been traced by Edward D. Seeber,<sup>82</sup> and J. M. Carrière has noted an adaptation by Berquin of *Sandford and Merton*.<sup>83</sup>

On the whole it is remarkable how much remains to be done, in spite of the research of American and foreign scholars. Work is still to be published on the French reputations of such English writers as Dryden, Locke, Addison, Steele, Fielding, Goldsmith, and Hume.

Before we can adequately estimate vogue or influence we ought to have an accurate and comprehensive bibliography of the actual publication of English literature in eighteenth-century France. In this field little has been done, either by American or foreign scholars, and the little done has been attempted sporadically and without the coöperation necessary to projects of this sort. Dr. Streeter's recent bibliographical study of the eighteenth-century English novel in French translation<sup>84</sup> is a step in the right direction, but unfortunately Dr. Streeter devotes most of his space not to the bibliography but to an interpretative introduction. He identifies a number of English originals, but his bibliography is difficult to consult, and suffers from too great dependence on secondary sources. The student who consults it, for example, to find out when and how often Richardson was translated and imitated in France will be disappointed.<sup>85</sup> What is needed, not only for the novel but for eighteenth-century translations in general, is a comprehensive bibliography made from actual study of the books themselves, from a census of libraries, and from all the available bibliographical sources—in short, the kind of thing done by Mr. and Mrs. Price in their invaluable bibliography of English literature in eighteenth-century Germany.<sup>86</sup>

80. F. C. Green, *Minuet*, p. 431. See B. W. Wells, "Richardson and Rousseau," *MLN*, xi (1896), cols. 449-463 (à propos of Texte), and H. S. Canby, "Pamela abroad," *MLN*, xviii (1903), 206-213. F. H. Wilcox's study of Prévost's translations of Richardson has already been noted.

81. Cf. also the article of C. S. Baldwin, "The Literary Influence of Sterne in France," *PMLA*, xvii (1902), 221-236.

82. "Oroonoko in France in the Eighteenth Century," *PMLA*, li (1936), 953-959.

83. "A French Adaptation of *Sandford and Merton*," *MLN*, l (1935), 238-242.

84. H. W. Streeter, *The Eighteenth-Century English Novel in French Translation: a Bibliographical Study*, New York, 1936.

85. Cf. my review in *MP* (forthcoming).

86. Mary Bell Price and Lawrence M. Price, "The Publication of English Literature

Another desideratum is a bibliography of all the French journals of the eighteenth century—a bringing of *Hatin* up to date.<sup>87</sup> Another suggestion is for a bibliography of the catalogues of private libraries in the eighteenth century. All of these types of investigation could most profitably be carried on as co-operative enterprises. It is to be hoped that the Anglo-French group of the Modern Language Association will undertake one or more of these projects in the near future.

Finally, Anglo-French studies suffer from the lack of an annual critical bibliography. What is needed is a critical survey limited to Anglo-French—and perhaps Franco-English and Franco-American—studies, more comprehensive than either of the two general bibliographies of comparative literature now available.<sup>88</sup> Such a publication would possibly interest more students in the field and would help to keep before us all the progress made in Anglo-French studies.

DONALD F. BOND

*The University of Chicago*

---

in Germany in the Eighteenth Century," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, xvii (1934), 1-288.

87. Miss Minnie Miller, of Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, has been interested in this project for some time.

88. In the *RLC*, and in the MHRA annual bibliography of English literature.

---

## DIDEROT AND THE IDEA OF PROGRESS

---

THE IDEA of progress is the keynote of the "philosophic movement." Its appearance, especially in Perrault's *Parallèles*, as a rallying point against the seventeenth-century ideals of authority, traditionalism and indifference to man's lot on this earth, marks the emergence of eighteenth-century humanism. There is scarcely a *philosophe* whose work was not inspired, directly or indirectly, by an optimistic faith in man's future progress and happiness, by hope for a better world; and quite fittingly it is with the unrestrained optimism of Condorcet's *Esquisse* that the curtain falls and a new epoch begins.

Given the importance of the question, Diderot's attitude towards it should be properly understood: his position is important in the history of the idea of progress in the eighteenth century; his reflections on the subject constitute a significant element of his philosophy and intellectual outlook. Critics and scholars have contented themselves with a too easy, too superficial affirmation of Diderot's faith in progress.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, not only has he been represented as a believer in the possibility of progress; he has even been proclaimed "le champion de la perfectibilité."<sup>2</sup> In reality, Diderot's ideas cannot be formulated so simply. He realizes the profound complexity of most abstract problems, and assumes no dogmatic position. He sees truth on both sides of the question, and the expression of his thought is frequently contradictory. The confusion is rendered still greater by Diderot's characteristic mobility and sensitivity to impressions. His ideas are frequently the reaction to a momentary stimulus, and many outbursts of enthusiastic optimism, many bitterly pessimistic passages represent his mood rather than his thought, reflect a page he has read, a story he has heard, something he has seen, or felt, such as persecution—or indigestion.<sup>3</sup> We shall attempt to determine, amidst these contradictions and variations, the true direction of his thought. In collating scattered passages, in systematizing his frag-

---

1. Cf. Delvaile, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'idée de progrès jusqu'à la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1910, p. 610 ff.

2. André Billy, *Diderot*, Paris, 1932, pp. 438-439.

3. Instances are numerous. Cf. *Lettres à Sophie Volland* (éd. Babelon), I, 87, 299; II, 230, 280; *Œuvres* (éd. Assézat et Tourneux), XIX, 452, 461-462; *Correspondance inédite* (éd. Babelon), I, 20, etc.

mentary ideas, we must of course realize that Diderot himself adopted no systematized view of this question—or of most others—that he made no effort to weld his ideas into a unified, logically developed philosophy. The most we attempt is to discover his general outlook and characteristic attitude throughout his writings, and at all periods of his life.

It is possible to speak of progress in widely separated spheres, and with each of these, Diderot's confidence in its realization varies considerably. He knew that the natural sciences had advanced remarkably since the beginning of the seventeenth century, and was convinced that they were entering upon a period during which they would be developed to a still more startling degree.<sup>4</sup> Hopes were high that science would eventually reveal to man all the secrets of nature, and it was difficult to see an end to the possibility of progress in that direction. Delvaille affirms that Diderot partook of the common belief in the continuous and unlimited advancement of the sciences.<sup>5</sup> It is easy to be misled by the *philosophe's* enthusiastic confidence in scientific achievements. He does not believe they are unlimited or continuous. There are two obstacles to the discovery of truth, one of which, at least, man will never conquer. The less serious obstacle is one that would naturally occur to any good *philosophe*: oppressive and obscurantist influences, namely, the government and the church. These influences, however, can be overcome, and Diderot is only defending the entire sense of his lifetime efforts when he insists that greater than the power of man's tyrants is the power of truth:

Que peut-elle alors en faveur de l'humanité? Tout avec le temps . . . elle finit et finira par être la plus forte. . . . L'intérêt du puissant passe, l'empire de la vérité dure à tout jamais . . . il faut qu'elle reste, cette vérité, ou que tout passe avec elle.<sup>6</sup>

True to his time, Diderot has implicit confidence in the triumph of truth. Yet it follows that progress may not be continuous and uninterrupted. Moreover, while the yoke of oppression will some day be overthrown, there is a far greater barrier to the discovery of truth: our sensorial and intellectual limitations. Diderot believes that these constitute a definite terminus to the march of scientific progress. Our so-called "knowledge" is only the superficial appearance of the truth, the partial, and possibly distorted vision that our organs are capable of giving us. Apparent agreement among our senses does not necessarily guarantee

4. Cf. the *Prospectus* to the *Encyclopédie*, *passim*.

5. *Op. cit.*, pp. 615-616.

6. "Réfutation de l'homme," *Œuvres*, II, 446.



the truth of their testimony, upon which are based all our judgments. And Diderot is forced to conclude:

Hélas! madame, quand on a mis les connaissances humaines dans la balance de Montaigne, on n'est pas éloigné de prendre sa devise. Car, que savons-nous? ce que c'est que la matière? nullement; ce que c'est que l'esprit et la pensée? encore moins; ce que c'est que le mouvement, l'espace et la durée? point du tout. . . . Nous ne savons donc presque rien.<sup>7</sup>

Nor will man's feeble mind ever solve any of the really important mysteries that perplex him; he is hopelessly defeated by his own limitations.

Quelle machine que l'univers! Entre les faits, les plus importants et les plus féconds ne se déroberont-ils à tout jamais à notre connaissance par la faiblesse de nos organes et l'imperfection de nos instruments? La limite du monde est-elle à la portée de nos télescopes?<sup>8</sup>

What then is the future of science, and the utility of our efforts? In the same work in which Diderot proclaims scientific progress to be assured, he insists on its limitations, and simultaneously, on the value of what can be done. If he emphasizes the ultimate failure of science, it is doubtless a reaction to current theories of indefinite progress, which he did not share:

Quand on vient à comparer la multitude infinie des phénomènes de la nature avec les bornes de notre entendement et la faiblesse de nos organes, peut-on jamais attendre autre chose de la lenteur de nos travaux, de leurs longues et fréquentes interruptions et de la rareté des génies créateurs, que quelques pièces rompues et séparées de la grande chaîne qui lie toutes les choses? . . . Quel est donc notre but? L'exécution d'un ouvrage qui ne peut jamais être fait et qui serait fort au-dessus de l'intelligence humaine s'il était achevé. . . . Mais est-il à présumer qu'il ne viendra point un temps où notre orgueil découragé abandonne l'ouvrage? . . . D'ailleurs l'utile circonscrit tout. Ce sera l'utile qui, dans quelques siècles, donnera des bornes à la physique expérimentale. . . . J'accorde des siècles à cette étude, parce que la sphère de son utilité est infiniment plus étendue que d'aucune science abstraite, et qu'elle est, sans contredit, la base de nos véritables connaissances.<sup>9</sup>

No one could deny that science was bound to make great progress;

7. "Lettre sur les aveugles," *Œuvres*, I, 329-330. A similar idea is expressed earlier in the same work (p. 311). We can have no confidence in our judgments concerning the universe, its order, perfection or duration, for our powers of conception are ridiculously futile when dealing with such mysteries as time and space. "Vous jugez de l'existence successive du monde, comme la mouche éphémère du vôtre. Le monde est éternel pour vous comme vous êtes éternel pour l'être qui ne vit qu'un instant. . . . Cependant nous passerons tous, sans qu'on puisse assigner ni l'étendue réelle que nous occupons, ni le temps précis que nous aurons duré. Le temps, l'espace et la matière ne sont peut-être qu'un point."

8. "Claude et Néron," *Œuvres*, III, 360.

9. *Pensées sur l'interprétation de la nature*, Pensée 6.

Diderot saw that progress as definitely limited. Man is condemned to live in eternal ignorance of what he would most know; beyond a certain point, his intelligence and his senses fail him.

Those who have touched upon Diderot's conception of progress seem to have unanimously neglected one important phase of his ideas: the improvement of man himself, the possibility of advancement towards happiness and moral perfection. Concerning these aspects of the problem, Diderot maintained fairly constantly the theory of a balance of opposing forces, a balance from which it is impossible to escape. His moral philosophy is based on the belief that virtue is a universal, innate quality, that a vicious action is always followed by inward shame and remorse, "même dans les âmes les plus dégradées."<sup>10</sup> Unfortunately, vicious tendencies are as natural and innate as virtuous ones. "Combien de passions violentes et naturelles dans le franc sauvage! Dans l'état policé, mille vicioux pour un sage."<sup>11</sup> Hopes for moral progress are therefore chimerical. Man is a composite of good and evil, and will remain thus as long as he endures. Human nature is a constant, and virtue will always be compensated by vice.

Le monde a beau vieillir, il ne change pas; il se peut que l'individu se perfectionne, mais la masse de l'espèce ne devient ni meilleure ni pire; la somme des passions malfaisantes reste la même, et les ennemis de toute chose bonne et utile sont sans nombre comme autrefois.<sup>12</sup>

This declaration is not to be considered as a mere *boutade*, inspired by the bitterness of persecution. Diderot expounded the same theory in more impartial moments, in a conversation at La Chevrette, for example, in a more picturesque way:

Si les méchants n'avaient pas cette énergie dans le crime, les bons n'auraient pas la même énergie dans la vertu. Si l'homme affaibli ne peut plus se porter aux grands maux, il ne pourra plus se porter aux grands biens; en cherchant à l'amender d'un côté, vous le dégradez de l'autre. Si Tarquin n'ose violer Lucrèce, Scévole ne tiendra pas son poignet sur un brasier ardent.<sup>13</sup>

What about the power of education, the influence of truth? It is doubtful whether these are strong enough ever to overcome human prejudices. Diderot, it is true, wavers on this point, and in one place compares the human comedy to a masked ball; if prolonged sufficiently, all the participants—our errors and vices—would be recognized.<sup>14</sup> At

10. Letter to Sophie Volland, Dec. 1, 1760 (éd. Babelon, II, 18).

11. "Claude et Nérón," *Œuvres*, III, 288. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 239: "Pourquoi donc tant de vicioux, au milieu de tant de prédicateurs de vertu?" etc.

12. "Avertissement au VIII<sup>e</sup> vol. de l'Encyclopédie," XIII, 171.

13. Letter to Sophie Volland, Sept. 30, 1760 (I, 193-194).

14. Fragment of a letter to same (III, 269).

other times, however, he writes in a less optimistic vein; truth may overcome error in science, and even injustice in society, but it cannot change human nature:

Mais, mon amie, c'est que la manière de remédier aux préjugés d'un peuple est encore à trouver. . . . Qui est-ce qui commencera? Est-ce que vous donnerez la première votre fille à un homme dont le père a été marqué d'ignominie?<sup>15</sup>

On apprend peu de choses aux hommes. Ce n'est pas la ligne que nous écrivons qui les amende.<sup>16</sup>

Superstition will never be destroyed among the masses, no matter what truths be known to the learned few: "les progrès de la lumière sont limités; elle ne gagne guère les faubourgs. Le peuple y est trop bête, trop misérable et trop occupé."<sup>17</sup> And so it is with what appeared to the *philosophes* the most nefarious of all superstitions, and one of the greatest obstacles to progress, religion. Unless its ministers are completely discredited by their conduct and vices, a religion cannot be destroyed by mere power of reason; it is, in the popular mind, beyond the touch of reason.<sup>18</sup>

History's lesson makes us confident of a limited scientific progress; unfortunately, it indicates only the impossibility of moral progress. Each time that Diderot dips into the record of humanity, he bears away a bitter pessimistic feeling that belies his hopes and ideals, and frequently upsets or enrages him.<sup>19</sup> In a calmer moment, after reading the *Essai sur les mœurs*, he writes to Voltaire:

Il me semble que ce n'est que depuis que je vous ai lu que je sache que de tous les temps le nombre des méchants a été le plus grand et le plus fort; celui des gens de bien, petit et persécuté; que c'est une loi générale à laquelle il faut se soumettre.<sup>20</sup>

In fact, it is quite possible that man, as a species, has already attained the summit of his possibilities. The day of great deeds and heroes is

15. Letter to same, Nov. 7, 1762 (II, 220).

16. Letter to Falconet, *Œuvres*, XVIII, 275.

17. Letter to Sophie Volland, Oct. 30, 1759 (I, 125).

18. "S'il est difficile de détruire des erreurs qui n'ont pour elles que leur généralité et leur vétusté, comment vient-on à bout de celles qui sont aussi générales, aussi vieilles et plus accompagnées de terreurs, appuyées de la menace des dieux, sucées avec le lait et prêchées par des bouches respectées et stipendiées à cet effet?" "Réfutation de l'Homme," *Œuvres*, II, 288-289.

19. "Je ne suis pas violent, eh bien, je me suis surpris, en parcourant certains règnes, le cœur gonflé de fureur, et jouant du poignard à ravir." (*Lettres à Sophie Volland*, I, 290.) Cf. *ibid.*, I, 273; II, 39; *Correspondance inédite*, I, 30. It is curious to note that Diderot, who was not an historian, drew pessimistic conclusions from his study of history, whereas Turgot and Condorcet, both able historians for the time, indulged in optimistic dreams about the perfectibility of mankind.

20. *Œuvres*, XIX, 460.

over. "Plus le monde vieillira, plus les hommes deviendront pauvres, petits et mesquins."<sup>21</sup>

The same inescapable balance of opposing forces governs man's capacity for happiness. Our efforts to achieve happiness—the motive of all human action, according to Diderot—are doomed to failure; humanity cannot surpass certain biological limits of happiness and our struggles in that direction are futile.

Peut-être n'est-il pas donné à l'homme d'étendre ou de restreindre la sphère de son bonheur ou de son malheur.<sup>22</sup>

Il m'est venu souvent dans la pensée que la somme des biens et des maux était variable pour chaque individu; mais que le bonheur et le malheur d'une espèce animale quelconque avait sa limite qu'elle ne pouvait franchir, et que peut-être nos efforts nous rendraient en dernier résultat autant d'inconvénient que d'avantage; en sorte que nous nous étions bien tourmentés pour accroître les deux membres d'une équation, entre lesquels il subsistait une éternelle et nécessaire égalité.<sup>23</sup>

Clearly, then, Diderot views with profound pessimism the possibility of man's moral and mental progress, or his attaining a state of greater happiness. This is very far from the faith, "so dear to the eighteenth century," in the infinite perfectibility of man.

It is only in the phase of social progress that Diderot's uncertainty has at all been recognized. "Diderot is wavering and skeptical on the question of indefinite social improvement."<sup>24</sup> Let us not get side tracked into the matter of civilization versus the state of nature; as does Delvaile, who devotes his efforts to demonstrating Diderot's essential preference for civilization and the satiric intent of the *Supplément au Voyage de Bougainville*. The question is really not whether society represents a progress over the "state of nature," but whether, since society has existed, it has made progress, and whether it is capable of further improvement. Diderot's statements refer principally to the latter part of the question. He does believe that definite progress is possible towards better government and a better organized society. The efforts of successive generations toward that end cannot be without effect:

Lorsqu'un homme vous soutiendra que les nations sont abandonnées sans ressource aux mensonges, à la force et aux passions, et que vous lui aurez demandé à quoi bon tant d'expériences, tant de méditations, tant d'écrits; s'il vous répond:

21. "Fragments politiques," *Œuvres*, iv, 41.

22. "Fragments échappés du portefeuille d'un philosophe," *Œuvres*, vi, 456; cf. *ibid.*, p. 445.

23. "Supplément au Voyage de Bougainville," *Œuvres*, ii, 248. Cf. *Lettres à Sophie Voland*, i, 145; ii, 246.

24. Bury, *The Idea of Progress*, London, 1924, p. 278.

A policer les mœurs, riez-lui au nez; car, sans s'en apercevoir, il vous accordera précisément ce que vous lui demandez.<sup>25</sup>

Diderot hoped that, in particular, his own efforts, and those of his *compagnons d'armes* would spread truth and help destroy fanaticism, tyranny and other "errors." He doubted that they could provoke any improvement in man himself, in human nature, but considered social abuses not quite so difficult to destroy as human vices.

Or jugez aux cris, à la fureur, à la persécution, aux bâchers, aux grincements de dents de ce marouffe-là, de l'importance qu'il met au coup qu'on lui porte. . . . C'est qu'à la longue, l'huile tue les insectes, et la goutte d'encre ces monstres-là.<sup>26</sup>

Real social progress is then a distinct possibility. Without that faith, much of the work of the *philosophes* would have been meaningless. Nevertheless, such progress can only be incomplete, and temporary. A perfect civilization can never be reached, nor can progress be maintained constantly. Again, Diderot evokes the balance of good and evil forces, and to it adds the cycle theory of history—inspired, doubtless, by the philosophy of Vico, some notion of which was most probably imparted to Diderot by his friend the abbé Galiani.<sup>27</sup>

Il est mille fois plus facile, j'en suis persuadé, pour un peuple éclairé de retourner à la barbarie que pour un peuple barbare de s'avancer d'un seul pas vers la civilisation. Il semble en vérité que toute chose, le bien comme le mal, ait son temps de maturité. Quand le bien atteint son point de perfection, il commence à tourner au mal; quand le mal est complet, il s'élève vers le bien.<sup>28</sup>

All civilizations must bow to the laws of time, and our own must suffer the same fate as those which have preceded us. This is Diderot's sentence against humanity, pronounced, strangely enough, in the midst of an eloquent apostrophe to the future greatness of the new American civilization; the climax of this enthusiastic passage is rather an anti-climax:

Puissent-ils reculer, au moins pour quelques siècles, le décret prononcé contre toutes les choses du monde; décret qui les a condamnées à avoir leur naissance, leur temps de vigueur, leur décrépitude et leur fin.<sup>29</sup>

A final word remains to be said on another aspect of progress, dis-

25. Letter to Falconet, Sept. 6, 1768 (*Œuvres*, xviii, 275-276).

26. Letter to Mme d'Epinay, 1767 (*Correspondance inédite*, I, 206-207). Speaking of tyrants, Diderot writes again to Falconet: "Or jugeons de la frayeur qu'ils ont de la vérité par les efforts qu'ils ont fait de tout temps pour l'étouffer, et jeter le peuple dans l'état d'ignorance et de stupidité." (*Œuvres*, xviii, 262-263.)

27. Cf. Busnelli, *Diderot et l'Italie*, Paris, 1925, p. 29.

28. Letter to Princess Dachkov, April 3, 1771 (*Œuvres*, xx, 29).

29. "Claude et Néron," *Œuvres*, III, 324.

cussed by Delvaille. He finds that Diderot's theory of evolution indicates a strong belief in progress in the realm of nature and the universe. "Aussi, chez Diderot, la doctrine du Progrès se présente-t-elle d'abord comme s'appliquant à l'ensemble des phénomènes du monde, des éléments qui le constituent, des êtres vivants et organisés qui le remplissent."<sup>30</sup> It is my opinion that Delvaille incorrectly places the stress on the evolutionary part of Diderot's theory, which is better titled "transformisme," for devolution, or disintegration is as much a part of it. The theory is a unified balance of growth, inertia and decline; Diderot's stress is clearly on the idea of continuous movement and change. As he puts it in a famous formula: "De même que dans les règnes animal et végétal, un individu commence, pour ainsi dire, s'accroît, dure, dépérit et passe; n'en serait-il pas de même des espèces entières?"<sup>31</sup>

Thus Diderot's ideas appear essentially coherent. Progress is certain, for a time. But it cannot continue indefinitely. When one half of the cycle has been run, the downward stretch awaits, sooner or later. Birth ends in death and all comes to nought, save to let the race be run again.

Diderot was an optimist. He believed that human nature is essentially good, that truth will always conquer; that virtue is always recompensed and vice punished; and that our civilization can and will make great progress. Humanity's efforts are certainly worthwhile, for we can improve our lot. Much good is to be done.

That far did Diderot's philosophic enthusiasm and optimism carry him. In him, as one can readily see in his correspondence, optimism was balanced, though not quite equally, by a measure of pessimism. His mind was too akin to that of his spiritual father, Montaigne, not to view skeptically the dreams of some of his contemporaries; he perceived too readily the infinite complexity of things, and found that in questions on which men were divided, truth is also divided.

How great can man's progress be, when he is but a passing shadow? He is, moreover, an unchangeable balance of good and evil, his life a perpetual see-saw between happiness and unhappiness. His civilizations rise and fall. Gifted above all other creatures, he will pry out many of nature's lesser secrets, and harness some of her forces, but his petty

30. *Op. cit.*, p. 611.

31. *Pensées . . . nature*, *Pensée* 18, 2. Cf. *Pensée* 12 and "Le Rêve de d'Alembert," *Œuvres*, II, 109-110. The same idea is developed in a fragment of a letter to Sophie Volland (III, 275) and in the "Lettre sur les aveugles," *Œuvres*, I, 311: "Qu'est-ce que ce monde, Monsieur Holmes? un composé sujet à des révolutions, qui toutes indiquent une tendance continuelle à la destruction; une succession rapide d'êtres qui s'entre-suivent, se poussent et disparaissent: une symétrie passagère; un ordre momentané."

science must halt before the insuperable wall of his own weakness. He is but an accident of nature, no more permanent than life itself, or the universe in which he is lost. He is twice defeated: by his own limitations, and by the eternal, unfathomable forces of nature.

LESTER GILBERT KRAKEUR

*Wittenberg College*



---

## TRENDS IN RECENT CRITICISM OF THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH THEATRE

---

It is a curious fact that opinions of authoritative critics are accepted as definitive by generations of students of literature, until one day someone happens to investigate sources, to read a text with new eyes which see what has not been seen before. Then a new direction and a fresh impetus are given to criticism, which moves forward by leaps and bounds until it appears again to have pronounced the ultimate judgment.

The study of the French theatre in the eighteenth century seems at present to be passing through a phase of rapid discovery. Older critics, dazzled by the lustre of the golden age, found the eighteenth-century theatre uninteresting, especially the earlier half of it, which they dismissed as offering nothing new or worthy of careful study. In his book, *The Evolution of Liberal Thought and Practice in the French Theatre. 1680-1757*, E. B. O. Borgerhoff refers to their opinion, that the theatre of the first half of the century was "a dying form and a mere shadow of the theatre of the seventeenth century."<sup>1</sup>

Borgerhoff believes this impression to be false, and wishes to correct it. In his Introduction he names as literary historians and critics of the old school G. Lanson, in whose *Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie française* he finds emphasis laid on the sterility of the drama during that period;<sup>2</sup> F. Gaiffe, whose *Le Drame en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* he selects for its tendency to attribute to Diderot and his group the origin of reforms in dramatic production;<sup>3</sup> and myself.<sup>4</sup> His own point of view he expresses thus:

---

1. Princeton, 1936, p. 1.

2. Paris, 1927.

3. Paris, 1910. Borgerhoff does not mention Gaiffe's *Le Rire*, Paris, 1931, although in this later work Gaiffe shows how the tone of comedy changed gradually during the first half of the century, how in the mingling of genres the foundation was being laid for Diderot, and how Fontenelle's liberal theories announced many of Diderot's—ideas which all corroborate Borgerhoff's conclusions.

4. *Stage Realism in France between Diderot and Antoine*, Bryn Mawr, 1928, p. 1: "In the first half of the eighteenth century, the theatre in France took its inspiration almost entirely from the traditions of the seventeenth century."

We believe that if the whole picture is to be seen, the first half of the century must be viewed as a period of advance in theory and experiment in practice leading up to developments that took place after the middle of the century, and we hold that there occur in the period phenomena generally believed to have taken place only after 1750. It has become more and more the tendency of modern eighteenth century criticism to consider that nothing existed in the second half of the century that did not exist in the first.<sup>5</sup>

I have assumed that "modern" criticism might comprise what has been published in the last ten years, and shall consider in discussing Borgerhoff's book, and especially the assertion just quoted, some of the other works that have appeared within that time.

Borgerhoff's treatment of various questions connected with the theatre is generally historical. He combines a discussion of many of the plays first presented or published between 1680 and 1757 with an analysis of the various critical treatises and theories of dramatic art written during that period. Beginning with the question of the transformation in tone, he shows how tragedy became tenderer and more tearful as *sensibilité* increased, and more melodramatic with the complication of plot and action, while comedy was becoming increasingly serious. At the same time, tragic and comic elements were appearing more and more frequently in the same play, as the distinctions between genres were breaking down. In the critical works of La Motte, Fontenelle and Louis Riccoboni he finds evidences that the century was conscious of these changes and considered them desirable.

Borgerhoff does not attempt to explain why such an evolution took place. He does not mention, for instance, what Gaiffe considers a probable contributing factor in the mingling of tones, namely the rigid subordination of the secondary theatres to the Théâtre-Français. Being forbidden to produce plays classified as *tragiques* or *nobles*, they were forced to widen their scope of appeal by adding serious and uplifting elements to their comedies.<sup>6</sup> Gaiffe goes back much farther than Borgerhoff to find the beginning of this mingling of comic and tragic, which he traces from the Middle Ages straight through the history of the French theatre: "Il [ce mélange] n'a été réellement proscrit de la scène française que pendant la brève période où le code de Boileau a joui d'un prestige incontesté."<sup>7</sup>

In the second chapter Borgerhoff treats the subject of transformation

5. Pages 1-2.

6. *Le Rire*, p. 180. All my allusions to Gaiffe will be to this book, which falls within the ten-year period I am reviewing.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 169. F. O. Nolte, in his *Early Middle Class Drama (1696-1774)*, Lancaster,

in staging, which was hinted at in isolated examples at first, and fostered by La Motte and especially by Voltaire. In this connexion Borgerhoff makes the usual remark that the changes in the technical presentation of plays were influenced by Shakespeare and the English domestic drama. This idea has been expressed by most students of the eighteenth century, but F. C. Green, in his *Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century*,<sup>8</sup> shows how the English influence may have been over-rated. As a conclusion to his discussion of Shakespeare Green says:

In writing these chapters my object was not to apologize for the failure of the eighteenth-century French to understand or to assimilate the art of Shakespeare. . . . It was rather to indicate how little actual significance attaches to statements about the profound influence exercised by Shakespeare on French dramatic taste.<sup>9</sup>

In comedy too, Green would diminish the importance of English plays in the development of the *drame*. He is not the only modern critic to note the close affinity between the drama and the novel of the eighteenth century, but unlike Trahard, for instance, who stresses the English influence on the novels of Prévost and thence on the plays of Nivelle de La Chaussée,<sup>10</sup> Green prefers to consider the *comédie lar-moyante* as a logical descendent of the seventeenth-century French novel:

And when we peruse the fiction of the closing seventeenth century, it is not surprising to find in the plays of the next generation some echo of that sensibility and that wearisome insistence on *la morale* and *la vertu* which characterize the romance of the *grand siècle*.<sup>11</sup>

Borgerhoff devotes a third chapter to the changing attitude toward rules and conventions, a subject closely bound up with the preceding discussion of stage practices. It is here that the evolution of the eighteenth-century theatre begins to appear in a logical pattern. Throughout the book there are two implications which other critics

Pa., 1935, p. 51, note, detects the mingling of tones also in the ancient Greek satiric plays.

8. London, 1935. The whole section on Drama is interesting, and praiseworthy in its attempt to discourage hasty inference of literary influences. Chaps. III-VI are especially pertinent here. For support of Borgerhoff's statement cf. Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 155; D. C. Stuart, *The Development of Dramatic Art*, N.Y. and London, 1928, p. 430; V. B. Grannis, *Dramatic Parody in Eighteenth Century France*, N.Y., Institute of French Studies, 1931, pp. 84-85: "The English models taught the French to tolerate on the stage scenes of the utmost horror, if only they painted a strong moral lesson." This I doubt: cf. Green's discussion of the French adaptations of Lillo and Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-147.

9. Page 128.

10. *Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1715-1789)*, Paris, 1931-32, I, 244-245; II, 9.

11. *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

have recognized more or less explicitly. The first is that dramatists and critics alike were striving to please the public. Both Fontenelle and La Motte declared that the aim of tragedy is to please.<sup>12</sup> But that desire to please has been given as the fundamental rule, the touchstone of classicism.<sup>13</sup> Did Gaiffe have this thought in mind among others when he applied to the eighteenth century the epithet *classique*: "Entre Molière et l'avènement du Romantisme, s'étend une période où triomphe, au moins en apparence, l'idéal classique"?<sup>14</sup>

The second implication is that the eighteenth century had little dramatic talent. In order to give productions that would please the public, playwrights were obliged to add interest to poor plays by emphasizing the spectacular, or by exaggerating the emotional, or by complicating the plot. When they tried to do so, they found themselves hampered by the rules, as Borgerhoff points out in the case of Destouches,<sup>15</sup> who tried to resuscitate the *comédie de caractère* by stressing the importance of plot, and whom Edna Fredrick also cites as typical of the whole century, which tended, she says, "in default of *fond*, to seek quality and beauty in the way in which an idea is presented rather than in the idea itself."<sup>16</sup> Both of these writers show clearly that what the century did have was critical ability, which made it dissatisfied with itself and conscious of a lack for which remedy must be sought. As Miss Fredrick says: "Its genius expressed itself in theory."<sup>17</sup> Borgerhoff seems vulnerable, however, when he states that "the theory will always outrun the practice."<sup>18</sup> He himself explains painstakingly and convincingly how Destouches' *Philosophe marié* (1727), La Motte's *Romulus* (1730), La Chaussée's *Mélanide* (1741), and especially Landois' *Silvie* (1741), put into actual practice many of the reforms about which Diderot was to theorize later.<sup>19</sup>

12. Cf. Lanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-137.

13. Cf. H. Peyre, *Qu'est-ce que le classicisme?* Paris, 1933, p. 36: "... l'auteur classique ne croit pas déroger en s'adaptant à son auditoire, en développant son individualité par une communion avec les préoccupations et les goûts de ses contemporains. Aussi peut-il se donner comme règle suprême de plaire."

14. *Op. cit.*, p. 120. Cf. H. Bidou, "Comme on jouait la comédie en 1760," in *Le Théâtre à Paris au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Conférences du Musée Carnavalet, 1929; Paris, 1930, p. 128.

15. Page 70. E. Henriot, "Le Théâtre satirique" in *Le Théâtre à Paris au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, pp. 37-38, explains the poor quality of plays by the popularity of the theatre and the wide-spread interest in it among the masses of the people, who naturally wanted to be diverted by the spectacular. The classical seventeenth-century drama was still admired, but by a select and cultured audience.

16. *The Plot and its Construction in Eighteenth Century Criticism of French Comedy*, Bryn Mawr, 1934, p. 33.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

18. Page 39.

19. Cf. pp. 15, 25, 41. Borgerhoff might have mentioned also Madame de Graffigny's prose

Borgerhoff ends his study before the date of publication of Diderot's *Entretiens sur le fils naturel*, which, he says, "has been generally considered to mark the turning point of dramatic theory away from the seventeenth-century attitude."<sup>20</sup> As Diderot is considered in relation to his century, as his originality is weighed in the light of greater knowledge of his contemporaries and predecessors, it seems increasingly evident that his true significance has not yet been fully understood. Ten years ago critics were saying with Lanson: "Tous les progrès de l'art scénique depuis cent cinquante ans sont sortis de Diderot."<sup>21</sup> Brenner and Goodyear, who pointed out that many of the elements in Diderot's dramatic code had found some expression before he adopted them, declared nevertheless: "It was only Diderot and his school who made a determined effort to reform serious drama."<sup>22</sup> Although D. C. Stuart praised La Motte for his insistence on stage pictures, striking "at this relatively early date," he was so held by the traditional conception of Diderot as the innovator in stage reform that later he gave him the sole credit for discovering and insisting upon the value of the stage picture.<sup>23</sup>

In 1931 Grannis undertook to present Diderot as the mouthpiece of a new social order:

Diderot was only giving expression to a social and economic situation which confronted him. The bourgeois class had risen to a position of prominence in the France of the eighteenth century. . . . Hence it was but natural that the bourgeois, having become class conscious, should desire to gain the same position in literature that they were occupying in real life. Diderot, who had arisen from their ranks, recognized the weight of this new social force and gave it opportune expression.<sup>24</sup>

The German point of view was expressed in the same year in a far more scholarly book, in which Diderot is deemed the leader in the practical reform of stagecraft:

tragedy *Cénie* (1750). Cf. Brenner and Goodyear, *Eighteenth-Century French Plays*, N.Y., 1927, Introduction, p. xiv. Cf. also H. Bidou, *op. cit.*, p. 127: Efforts to reform the presentation of plays and especially the acting show a desire for the subtleties of psychological analysis which the playwrights no longer knew how to put into the plays themselves.

20. Page 4.

21. Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

22. *Op. cit.*, p. xi.

23. *Op. cit.*, pp. 417, 440.

24. *Op. cit.*, p. 85. This passage seems to me to illustrate the dangers of over-simplification. I cannot refrain from quoting as an example of astonishing inaccuracy a few sentences which precede it: "But after Rousseau a new current set in,—the sensibilité which was to exercise so profound an influence upon the feeling and literature of the succeeding century. . . . By the side of the hardened and cynical wit is found the tearful, emotional Man-of-feeling. After Rousseau this tendency first took dramatic form in the *comédie larmoyante*, with Nivelle de la Chaussée as its exponent."

Schon 1748, in seinem Jugendroman "Les Bijoux indiscrets", hatte Diderot das Signal zu einer Reform der französischen Tragödie und der Darstellung gegeben. Hier schon geht er anders vor als die andern Theoretiker. La Motte und Landois hatten vor ihm Versuche gemacht, die Tragödie im Sinne der neuen Zeit umzugestalten. Aber besonders La Motte sieht es lediglich auf Publikumswirksamkeit ab. Diderot gräbt tiefer. . . . Diderot ist der eigentliche Begründer der direkten Bühnenanweisungen. . . . Diderot wird zum Schöpfer des Dramas, er schreibt auch die Theorie sowohl des Dramas wie seiner Darstellung.<sup>25</sup>

Modern criticism in France seems inclined still to believe that Diderot marks the turn from the old to the new. That is the thesis of Trahard in his interesting discussion of dramatic theories, in which he declares that Diderot "conçoit une théorie neuve dont les parties sont vigoureusement liées en un système cohérent," and that he reacted against "les innombrables fabricateurs de tragédies et de comédies bâtarde, qui déshonorent la scène française depuis la mort de Racine et de Molière." In conclusion he affirms that one must recognize in Diderot's dramatic theories "une originalité lourde d'avenir."<sup>26</sup>

In America it is books like Borgerhoff's that have supplied historical material on which to base what seems to me at present a fair estimate of Diderot. Nolte and Green say that his sponsorship of the *drame* definitely "established" a genre which had been developing since the early years of the century.<sup>27</sup> Miss Frederick strikes an admirable balance in her analysis of Diderot's genius:

He seems to have had an enormous capacity for assimilation; although his impressionable nature was likely to be influenced by the work of his predecessors, Diderot was at the same time endowed with enough creative genius, enough independence of thought to enable him to give to struggling tendencies a more original, more positive interpretation. . . . Diderot's originality is thus shown in his insistence on those phases of dramatic art which, in spite of the very real advances made before his time, had received only secondary and sporadic attention.<sup>28</sup>

On the whole, the position of certain modern students of the eighteenth-century theatre in France is somewhat paradoxical. Setting out rather aggressively to demonstrate what the second half of the century owed to the first, they have gone back farther and farther, discrediting Beaumarchais as inventor of the *pièce bien faite*, showing how Diderot assimilated ideas already expressed, and even to some extent put into practice, before the publication of his dramatic criticism, detecting a

25. Elisabeth Burgund, *Die Entwicklung der Theorie der französischen Schauspielkunst im 18. Jahrhundert bis zur Revolution*, Breslau, 1931, pp. 69, 77, 121.

26. *Op. cit.*, II, chap. x, "L'Art dramatique," 186 ff.

27. Nolte, *op. cit.*, p. 32, n. 10; Green, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

28. *Op. cit.*, p. 60, 74-75.

mingling of tones before Nivelles de La Chaussée. They have discovered that the themes associated with the eighteenth-century melodrama existed already in the seventeenth century.<sup>29</sup> They have shown that the rebellious valet appeared in seventeenth-century comedy before Lesage "created" him in *Turcaret*.<sup>30</sup>

All told I am inclined, in spite of Borgerhoff and others, to repeat in modified form the statement which I made ten years ago and to which Borgerhoff took exception: In the first half of the eighteenth century, the theatre in France continued its evolution along lines whose direction was determined to a great extent by the tendencies of the seventeenth century. The next decade of research will show perhaps to what extent this is true.

EDITH MELCHER

*Wellesley College*

29. Cf. E. C. Van Bellen, *Les Origines du mélodrame*, Utrecht, 1927. Cf. also D. C. Stuart, *op. cit.*, p. 416.

30. Maurice Baudin, "Un Tournant de la carrière du valet de comédie," in *MLN*, XLVI (1931), 240-245.



---

## MAURICE BARRÈS' COLLABORATION WITH THE ACTION FRANÇAISE

---

BECAUSE MAURICE BARRÈS called the Dreyfus Case an *historiette*<sup>1</sup> and later professed only a minimum of interest in it, the fact that under the impetus of the *Affaire* he tried to join forces with the militant Charles Maurras is commonly unrecognized. From 1899 to 1903 Barrès, as a sponsor of the organization, published in the *Revue d'Action Française* a dozen items.<sup>2</sup> The length of this list is itself a response to students, like Mme Cécile Delhorbe,<sup>3</sup> who consider the Dreyfus Case of no importance in Barrès' work. If the *Affaire* moved him so little, why was he publishing this material—whose importance anyone familiar with his writings will recognize by the titles alone—in this Anti-Dreyfusard periodical?

In 1899, not yet Royalist and but vaguely united on matters of policy, the Action Française was making political bed-fellows of such divergent personalities as Charles Maurras and Ferdinand Brunetière. In its first manifesto the group had professed to be an organization of conservative intellectuals formed in response to an appeal from Barrès. To the public he appeared the instigator of the movement. His recent shift in emphasis from the development of the ego to the theme of national energy had

---

1. *Cahiers*, II, 116.

2. a. "Un Programme politique de M.B. Nationalisme—Protectionisme—Socialisme," Sept. 15, 1900 (III, 445).

b. "A propos de la rétrocession de Metz," Sept. 15, 1900 (III, 461). A letter from Barrès to Robinet de Cléry, of inconsiderable importance.

c. "Trois Têtes de mort," Nov. 1, 1900 (III, 721).

d. "Discours," June 15, 1901 (IV, 985). Stenographic report of Barrès' speech at the anniversary dinner of the AF.

e. "Paris-Berlin—1806-1901," July 15, 1901 (V, 100).

f. "Clémenceau," Sept. 1, 1901 (V, 364).

g. "Leurs Figures," Oct. 15 and Dec. 1, 1901 (V, 598). Second chapter of the book of same title.

h. "Le Roman de l'énergie nationale," Feb. 1, 1902 (VI, 197).

i. "Scènes et doctrines du nationalisme," May 1, 1902 (VI, 737). Preliminary chapter of the book of same title.

j. "L'Alsace et la Lorraine," June 15, 1902 (VI, 1002).

k. "Une Impératrice de la solitude," Oct. 1, 1902 (VII, 523).

l. "Maurice Barrès et F. Amouretti," Sept. 1, 1903 (X, 376).

m. "Lettre," Oct. 15, 1906 (XXIV, 81). Perfunctory homage to General Mercier.

3. *L'Affaire Dreyfus et les écrivains français*, Paris, 1932. Possibly because of her disdain for the politics of Maurras, Mme Delhorbe stopped short of discovering this material.

warmed conservative hearts and made his name of value to the nascent Action Française. With Maurras, whom he had known at least since 1881, he shared a faith in Nationalism, Anti-Semitism, Regionalism, *Décentralisation*, Anti-Protestantism,<sup>4</sup> and the guilt of Dreyfus, and for the moment the points at which they were at variance did not emerge. Early references to Barrès by other contributors to the *Revue* are very flattering.<sup>5</sup> And by all appearances Barrès accepted his status with the Action Française with no real perception of how the group would develop. He regarded it as an association to function in the intellectual field somewhat as the *Ligue des Patriotes* and the *Ligue de la Patrie Française* were already functioning in others. He saw its task as one of education by propaganda;<sup>6</sup> in July, 1900, at the dinner given by the Action Française in honor of *L'Appel au Soldat*, Barrès drank to the "vertu éducative" of the group. Paul Bourget had just told the gathering that Barrès was a Counter-Revolutionary, and Henri Vaugeois, speaking after Barrès, called on those present to follow Barrès' lead and find the best way to use *force* for the salvation of the country.<sup>7</sup> These straws could have told Barrès which way the wind was already blowing. Yet as late as February, 1901, he dwelt once more on the educative nature of the movement's purpose.<sup>8</sup> With the conversion of Vaugeois to Royalism in 1900, the influence of Maurras had augmented and that of Barrès had gone into a decline. Already the organization had begun to emphasize the points in which it agreed with Barrès and to suppress as much as possible his heresies. In a most cordial critical article, in 1900, Lucien Corpechot minimized the importance of the *Culte du moi* in Barrès and magnified that of the *Energie nationale*. Implicit in his analysis is the admission that from the Action Française point of view, it is on the latter phase that attention must be fixed.<sup>9</sup> A year later Maurras himself is visibly less satisfied, feeling that Barrès has refused to follow the logic of national energy to its inevitable conclusion. "C'est mon scandale, Barrès n'est pas royaliste."<sup>10</sup>

4. Whatever may have been the religion of Barrès, there is no denying the similarity of many utterances of the "pagan" Maurras with the former's explanation of his own accord with the Catholics: "Je me préoccupe de protéger l'autonomie et la continuité françaises. . . ." (*Scènes et doctrines* . . . , pp. 60-61.)

5. "Notre maître le plus cher et le plus intime." (L. Corpechot, "Quelques attitudes," III, 126.) "Je suis persuadé que sa lecture exciterait à l'action beaucoup de bonnes volontés platoniques ou stériles dont notre France ne manque pas." (Capelain Cortambert, "A Propos de l'Appel au Soldat," III, 103.)

6. *Scènes et doctrines* . . . , p. 103.

7. Report in *Revue d'Action Française*, Aug. 1, 1900 (III, 184 ff.).

8. *Ibid.*, IV, 122.

9. *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

10. Oct. 1, 1902 (VII, 515).

Finally, in 1903, the Action Française openly recapitulated its differences with Barrès. In a long article, Lucien Maury remarks ironically that the fact that Nationalism has claims strong enough to impress Barrès is a testimonial to the power of the doctrine. He makes no bones of saying that Barrès has missed the essential point of Nationalism, that it should go hand in hand with monarchy. No other way than that of Maurras, concludes the critic, can be efficacious.<sup>11</sup> Clearly, by this time Barrès was on his way out of the Action Française.

For some time previously it had been evident that he would not agitate for the return of the monarchy, feeling that the Revolution was too much a part of French tradition to be removed by anyone's fiat. To Maurras' *Enquête sur la monarchie* he replied in the negative.<sup>12</sup>

Whether or not strained social relations hastened the rupture,<sup>13</sup> by 1904 Barrès was out entirely. By 1908 at the latest, when the Action Française had completely clarified the distinction between itself and all other Nationalist groups, Barrès was convinced of the organization's failure . . . to the extent of predicting that it could not last out another six months.<sup>14</sup>

With Maurras once at the helm, there was no longer room for even the mildest heresy. Barrès could have continued at the Action Française only at the sacrifice of some of his ideas. His defection was thus inevitable; neither he nor Maurras was a man to compromise where ideas were concerned. One cannot help wondering, however, what marks would have been left on his work had the collaboration been further extended.

W. M. FROHOCK

Columbia University

11. "Le Témoignage de Barrès," Oct. 15, 1903 (XI, 109).

12. *Scènes et doctrines* . . . , pp. 71, 83.

13. R. Launay, "M.B. à l'A.F." (*Mercur de France*, CLXIX (1924), 679) relates an abortive duel between Paul Déroulède and the political secretary of the Duc de Guise, in which Barrès was asked to serve as the former's second. The duel never took place, but Barrès' embarrassment and the indignation of the Action Française were equally profound. Documents to verify this report, however, seem unavailable in America.

14. H. Massis, *Evocations*, Paris, Plon, 1931, I, 46.

---

## FAIRE UNE SCARLATINE (UNE TYPHOÏDE)

---

MM. LE BIDOIS, dans leur *Syntaxe du français moderne*, I, § 134, nous expliquent, dans le type d'expression indiqué (qui est usuel dans le langage des médecins d'aujourd'hui et pour des maladies non localisées), l'article indéfini par un besoin d'individualiser la maladie: "C'est peut-être parce que la scarlatine, la typhoïde, qui sont pour les profanes des maladies bien caractérisées, bien distinctes, ne laissent pas d'être pour le médecin des cas complexes qui peuvent toujours avoir quelque chose de spécial." De même ils expliquent le verbe *faire* "par le dessein de marquer un phénomène morbide en voie d'évolution." Au §140 la construction concurrente avec partitif: *faire de la bronchite*, est comparée à *faire de la politique*, où l'on voit "une participation . . . une part prise à un ensemble" (d'intérêts).

MM. Damourette et Pichon, dans leur *Essai de grammaire de la langue française*, I, §368, déclarent que, si l'on dit normalement: avoir la rougeole, la scarlatine, la syphilis, la typhoïde etc., mais: avoir une ou de la bronchite, une pneumonie, c'est parce qu'il s'agit dans la première série de maladies qu'on a une fois pour toutes, dans la seconde de maladies pouvant se répéter. Dans le premier cas, "les locutions ressortissent . . . à la notoriété générale"; dans le second, "on emploie le transitoire." Le peuple, moins instruit, "fait du notoire un usage plus étendu" (*j'ai la bronchite, le rhume*); au contraire les médecins emploient plutôt le transitoire que le notoire, "principalement quand ils substituent le verbe *faire* au verbe *avoir*: *il a fait une rougeole*."

J'ai déjà indiqué dans mon compte-rendu de ce dernier ouvrage (ZRP, LII, 631) que, dans le premier type (*avoir la rougeole* etc.), nous sommes en présence d'une conception de la maladie-force, du démon de la maladie: de là l'article défini, indiquant pour ainsi dire la personnification de la maladie, la Maladie. En effet, la fièvre se répète bien des fois dans la vie de l'homme, et pourtant on dit: *il a la fièvre*. Le peuple, asservi, malgré la fausse instruction qui corrompt même Bouvard et Pécuchet, aux anciennes croyances, continue à voir dans la maladie une attaque démoniaque (d'où: *j'ai la bronchite*), alors que le médecin, plus rationaliste, voit la maladie plutôt sous l'espèce de l'éphémère.

Mais est-ce seulement le 'transitoire' (Damourette-Pichon), 'l'évolution' (Le Bidois) qu'indique ce *faire* de l'argot médecin? Je crois que Littré a vu juste, en rangeant les emplois de *faire* dans l'ordre suivant:

- 29 Consacrer un temps à l'étude d'une chose (*faire ses humanités, faire son temps, accomplir les années de son service*).
- 30 Il se dit en parlant des différentes professions, métiers, emplois qu'on exerce (*faire la médecine, le commerce, la banque*).
- 31 Passer par, avoir pour maîtres, en parlant de domestiques (*faire plusieurs maisons, plusieurs maîtres*) [On pourrait ajouter *faire le boulevard* dans l'argot des filles].
- 32 *Faire une maladie*, passer par une maladie, la subir (ex. de Genlis: "Elle a fait une maladie de langueur, et s'est vue réduite à la dernière misère").
- 33 Il se dit de différentes occupations de la vie courante (*faire de l'exercice*) [J'ajoute: *du piano, du canotage* etc.].

Je dois dire que cela a été mon sentiment personnel, avant de consulter mon Littré, que de ranger *faire une maladie* parmi des occupations régulières. Ce que le médecin, en effet, voit dans la maladie, c'est le parcours régulier, normal, prévisible, de l'évolution pathologique: le médecin doit dominer la maladie, l'assujettir aux règles trouvées par la science, c'est pourquoi le malade *fait de la fièvre* (en allemand on dirait: *er macht ein Fieber durch*, où le *durch* donne l'idée de l'évolution) comme on *fait du piano*, c'est à dire méthodiquement. Un docteur dit chez Maurois (*Le Cercle de famille*, p. 42): "Elle doit faire, non seulement du piano, mais du solfège et des dictées musicales," exactement comme il eût dit: "Elle prendra un quart de comprimé d'aspirine avant de s'endormir, pas plus. . . ." On voit que l'auteur a senti, dans l'expression *faire du piano* employée par un médecin, la régularité que prescrit à la pensée du médecin sa mentalité. D'autre part un passage comme (*ibid.*, p. 288): "Il a été obligé de recourir à l'argent du public pour des affaires jeunes, encore douteuses, et qui n'ont pas fait leur maladie," montre bien, par le possessif, que *faire* est employé comme l'expression du normal: toute affaire saine doit avoir sa maladie (en allemand on dirait: *Kinderkrankheiten*). Cf. pour le possessif de régularité Céline, *Mort à crédit*, p. 82: "Auguste tenait à *faire sa crise*. Il cherchait un petit prétexte." D'ailleurs, je crois que *faire une maladie* est depuis longtemps sorti des milieux médicaux, pour devenir simplement populaire, à en juger d'après les exemples suivants: Morand, *France-la-doulce*, p. 164 (c'est l'auteur, non pas un médecin qui parle): "Dans les brouillards de novembre, son âme slave fit de la neurasthénie; Londres lui rappelait de mauvais souvenirs"; Céline, *op. cit.*, p. 448: "il faisait une crise plus

ou moins grave"; *Ibid.*, p. 372: "Ils faisaient une telle morte-saison qu'ils pouvaient plus se défendre."

*Faire*, actif, est devenu passif (= 'subir', Cf. all. *durchmachen* [p. ex. Leiden]), la régularité de l'action a eu le dessus sur l'activité; il y a une régularité qui fait l'impression du machinal, de la passivité. Nous avons maintenant un verbe bifurqué, presque deux homonymes:

1. *faire*—'agir'
2. *faire*—'être agi,' 'subir',

qui peuvent provoquer des malentendus ou des jeux de mots: Céline, *op. cit.*, p. 650: "Il [le brigadier] a demandé à la vioque . . . ce qu'il faisait donc son Courtail, avant qu'ils arrivent à Blême? Elle l'a compris tout de travers . . . Elle lui répondait 'Rhumatismes.'"

Comme *faire une maladie* n'est plus actif, il faut un autre verbe pour exprimer l'acquisition plutôt volontaire d'une maladie: p. ex. *piquer une crise* (comme *piquer un chien, un renard*); de là Céline, *op. cit.*, p. 83: "Papa . . . a piqué une colère."

*Faire une maladie* est d'abord une expression du *homo faber*, victorieux de la matière et de la contingence. Mais, hélas! l'homme est pris dans l'engrenage de ce monde et le mot qui proclamait tantôt encore sa victoire, en un tour de main chante sa passivité, son acceptation du sort.<sup>1</sup>

LEO SPITZER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

1. Dans une phrase comme *NRF*, XLIX (1937), 1032: "[ils vinrent chez Martin du Gard] pourvu qu'ils eussent leur franc-parler et qu'ils ne fissent pas de complexes", c'est l'expression avec *avoir* qui traduit l'activité, celle avec *faire* qui dénonce la passivité. Monde renversé!

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Etude sur la Chanson de Roland.* Par JEAN GYÖRY. Paris, E. Droz, 1936. Pp. 126.

*Encuntre mei revelerunt li Saisne  
Et Hungre et Bugre et tante gent averse . . .*

Parmi ces hongrois dont Charlemagne prophétisait ainsi la tumultueuse levée il en est un, M. Jean Györy, auquel il doit sourire dans sa barbe légendaire. Car Jean Györy a écrit sur Charles, sur Roland et sur leur poète un petit livre plein d'intelligence et d'amour.

Ce poète, pour Jean Györy comme déjà pour Tavernier et pour Jenkins, c'est Turol d'Envermeu qui fut évêque de Bayeux et qui finit moine du Bec. Et l'inspiration et le cadre de la geste de Turol d'Envermeu ce serait la chanson provençale de sainte Foy. Il faut dire que les liens entre ce Turol et sainte Foy sont attestés comme aussi les liens entre le culte de la vierge militante d'Agen et Roncevaux et la Normandie. Un curieux récit nous raconte la guérison miraculeuse de Turol d'Envermeu par l'intercession de sainte Foy et, d'autre part, Bédier a établi la filiation des sanctuaires consacrés à la vierge d'Agen: Conques d'Aveyron, Roncevaux, Conches de Normandie. Tout cela se tient. Cependant, Jean Györy qui intéresse et entraîne ne réussit pas à convaincre pleinement (pages 18 et seq.). La connaissance intime qu'il attribue à son Turol de la chanson provençale ne ressort pas nettement de l'analyse qu'il donne (pages 17-26). D'autre part, cette connaissance n'aurait guère pu résulter que d'un pèlerinage de Turol d'Envermeu au sanctuaire méridional de la sainte. Or le récit du miracle de sa guérison, récit minutieux, récit pénétré de dévotion envers sainte Foy, récit postérieur à la mort de Turol ne souffle mot d'un tel pèlerinage; ni même d'un vœu. Tout ce que fait Turol guéri par sainte Foy c'est de poser sur un autel normand un cierge de taille décente, *candelam congruam*. Et cette chandelle n'éclaire pas notre question.

Au reste—et c'est ici un champ ouvert par ses prédécesseurs mais qu'il creuse et sème de façon originale—Jean Györy exploite surtout, pour le contenu du *Roland*, la littérature latine de la première croisade. Ce serait là la tradition épique où l'auteur du *Roland* aurait puisé pour ses thèmes. Nous avons affaire, selon Jean Györy, à une espèce de "suite des chroniques de la première croisade" et à un transfert dans le passé poétique d'une idéologie religieuse et guerrière qui était vivante, actuelle pour l'auteur et ses auditeurs. Dans la plus belle des gestes il y a la *geste* si on entend par là "un ensemble de traditions littéraires" mais il y a aussi la *chanson*, à savoir une proche et chaude remembrance par quoi "le passé est rendu



actuel." Si on en croit Jean Györy et l'interprétation qu'il donne du fameux vers 788

*Deus me confonde se la geste en desment*

le poète aurait lui-même posé cette dualité. Car ce vers signifierait "Dieu me confonde si je démens les gestes *Dei per Francos*" (pages 52 et seq.). D'autre part, le dernier vers de la geste signifierait en somme que Turol "en terminant son œuvre vient de traduire une geste." Ainsi voilà une interprétation nouvelle de *declinet!* Etait-elle bien nécessaire alors que les exemples du temps et français et provençaux et le sens commun et H. K. Stone (*MP*, xxxiii, 337-350) nous offrent le sens fort clair d'*exposer*? Au surplus, on ne m'ôtera pas de l'idée, je l'avoue, que ce n'est pas Turol qui parle ici. Ce vers pue le scribe.

Il arrive plus d'une fois que le don de la formule pleine, saisissante trahit, force la pensée de Jean Györy et qu'en affirmant trop il invite à douter—trop peut-être. Dans les questions de fait et dans ses interprétations on le suit avec une admiration méfiante. Mais en cherchant parfois "midi à quatorze heures" il trouve le jour, la lumière. Le tout pour le lecteur est de faire la correction et le lecteur, même s'il refuse de suivre l'auteur dans certaines de ses traverses, sera orienté vers une compréhension neuve de la geste. Ainsi les pages 58-87, si on les échenille de quelques rapprochements forcés, sont des pages remarquables, il me semble, par la justesse et aussi le relief et l'élan. Les sentiments intellectuels de la geste, la sérénité souveraine dont elle est empreinte, la subordination du national au religieux, les rapports de l'ascétisme de Roland avec celui de saint Alexis sont indiqués avec une rare finesse et vigueur de trait. Il en est de même du chapitre vi où Jean Györy nous présente la geste comme une dialectique armée, comme un débat autant que combat, entre les païens qui ont tort et les chrétiens qui ont droit. Ce sublime entêtement dans la conscience juridique, cette certitude (où le moral, le légal se confondent avec le religieux) c'est le motif tenace de la geste. Sentiment fort, sentiment simple au fond et grand par sa simplicité:

*Païen unt tort et chrestiens unt dreit.*

C'est là, dans la littérature française, la première affirmation de la conscience collective. Mais ce qu'elle a de beau c'est son absolu optimisme moral, la claire confiance en la victoire finale du droit. Et cette idée qui sent très fort la première croisade ne respire peut-être pas autant le millénarisme apocalyptique ni le réalisme scolastique. La *Chanson de Roland* ne s'explique pas toute seule, il n'est que trop vrai, mais il en est d'elle comme d'autres grandes œuvres du passé: il peut y avoir de la part des érudits modernes une somptueuse illusion à prétendre savoir plus de choses sur l'œuvre que l'auteur n'en savait lui-même.

Ce reproche ne s'adresse pas à M. Györy particulièrement car il a plutôt le don de revivre que de "refaire." Et son livre a, quand il ne s'embarrasse point de problèmes et d'hypothèses superflus, un grand souffle de vérité. Ce

livre entraîne le lecteur vers les sommets authentiques de la geste. Le texte propre n'est barbelé en son pied d'aucun sigle, d'aucune note. Les *Notes*—qui constituent une bibliographie *up to date*—sont massées à la fin du volume (pages 109-126). Mais leur rapport, leur jeu avec le texte n'est pas indiqué de façon assez précise. On ne sait pas assez ce que l'auteur prend et ce qu'il laisse. Ce livre qui a, dans sa ferveur hardie, quelque chose de chevaleresque a, dans sa méthode, quelque chose de cavalier. Et on peut ne pas aimer cela autant que le reste.

LOUIS CONS

Harvard University

*Le Haut Livre du Graal, Perlesvaus. Vol. II, Commentary and Notes.* Edited by WILLIAM A. NITZE and Collaborators. The Modern Philology Monographs of the University of Chicago, 1937. Pp. 398.

1932 saw the completion of the text volume of *Perlesvaus*, and 1937 sees the completion of the commentary. Though Professor Nitze has many other claims to distinction, these two volumes are and will be his monument as a scholar. Toward this culmination his publications over his whole professional career have tended, and the present reviewer wishes to pay his tribute to the wide and ripe scholarship here represented. There is no matter connected with manuscript history and relationship, dialect, date, literary art, and sources which does not receive due consideration. Laying aside the temptation to violent partisanship, Professor Nitze and his collaborators have brought to this investigation a rich store of knowledge and cool judgment. If in considering various issues raised in this book, I differ from the author, it is because the subject of the Grail romances is not a closed book, and scholars, though ever winning nearer to the goal, have not reached it yet.

Chapter I, which is outside the range of my competence, gives a detailed review of the history of the MSS and their dialectal peculiarities. Chapter II re-states Nitze's familiar position concerning the relation of *Perlesvaus* to Glastonbury, gives the fullest account of the exhumation of Arthur, and explains completely the curious history of the mythical Glasteing. That *Perlesvaus* reflects an acquaintance with Glastonbury and its traditions is unquestionable and that the romance is a religious tract is equally so, but to call the romance "monastic propaganda (Glastonbury)" (page 172) seems to go beyond the facts. For there is little talk of monasteries even when Glastonbury is in question, but a great deal of hermits; besides, of the 383 pages occupied by the text in this edition, only two deal with visits to Avalon, and there are but two other references. The author knows Glastonbury simply as the sepulture of Arthur, Guinevere, and their son; there is no association with the Grail or the Grail Hero or Joseph of Arimathea. From a propagandist worthy of the name one might have expected more. The absence of Anglo-Norman features from any MS and the extremely vague knowledge displayed of British geography, apart from Glastonbury and Tintagel, point

to an author who came over from the Continent and visited the west of England—perhaps Penzance was his port.<sup>1</sup> An imaginative cleric, he found the Grail stories fascinating, and when he composed a romance he naturally included his recollections of Glastonbury and Tintagel, but added nothing to the already existing traditions of these places. He very possibly utilized stories in some Latin manuscript (such as the *De Ortu Waluani*, the *Historia Meriadoci*, or *Arthur and Gorlagon*), which he had brought from the holy house of Avalon (page 45); for though I consider him capable of exaggeration and artistic manipulation, I am reluctant to believe him an out-and-out liar, and there is the story of Ider interpolated in the *De Antiquitate Glastoniae* to show that romantic Arthurian fiction in Latin was not unknown at Glastonbury at this time.<sup>2</sup> I am not convinced that the passage in the *De Antiquitate* concerning the naming of Glastonbury is due to William of Malmesbury himself. The argument (page 49 f.) that the mention of “insula Avalloniae” must antedate Geoffrey’s *Historia* (ca. 1136) because there is no mention of Arthur’s going there rests on the doubtful assumption that any monk interpolating the *De Antiquitate* after 1136 would have been so acutely conscious of Geoffrey’s mere mention of the passing of Arthur to Avalon that the one name would have inevitably produced a full reference to the other.

This brings up a crux. Professor Cons and Mr. Slover have presented a good case for the derivation of Avallo from a Celtic word meaning “apple,” and have, less convincingly, asserted that the derivation from a personal name Avallo, Avalloc, or Avallach was a hypothesis invented by the author of the passage in the *De Antiquitate*.<sup>3</sup> I do not deny that originally *insula Avallonis* or the Welsh *Ynis Avallach* may have meant *insula pomorum*; certainly that is what the phrase meant to Geoffrey and some of his contemporaries. But anyone conversant with Irish and Welsh explanations of place-names must realize that an alternative etymology, however factitious, may have had long currency side by side with the real one.<sup>4</sup> And this may well have been the case with Avallo. For there is a Welsh triad of uncertain date which attributes to a person, Avallach, certain family relationships which accord with those which can be pieced together out of four non-Welsh sources. The triad tells us that he had a daughter Modron, a son-in-law Uryen, a grandson Owein.<sup>5</sup> The four non-Welsh sources tell us that Avalloc had daughters, one of whom was Morgen, that she had a husband Urien and a son Yvain. This correspondence cannot be accidental. The question remains: Does the triad

1. On his knowledge of Glastonbury cf. p. 46 ff.; of Tintagel, p. 319 f.; of Penzance, p. 225.

2. E. K. Chambers, *Arthur of Britain*, London, 1927, pp. 118-121, 267.

3. *MP*, xxviii (1930-31), 394, 398. Accepted by Nitze, p. 55 ff.

4. Cf. the Irish *Diunsenchas* and W. J. Gruffydd, *Math Vab Mathonwy*, Cardiff, 1928, p. 305.

5. J. Loth, *Mabinogion*, Paris, 1913, II, 284. “Owein, fils d’Uryen, et Morvudd, sa sœur, en même temps dans le sein de Modron, fille d’Avallach.”

repose on Welsh tradition, or was it composed by combining the testimony of the *De Antiquitate*,<sup>6</sup> the *Vita Merlini*,<sup>7</sup> the *Gesta Regum Britanniae*,<sup>8</sup> and the *Huth Merlin*?<sup>9</sup> The second alternative is so improbable that we are driven to the conclusion that the triad represents the basic tradition from which these scattered references to the genealogy of Avalloc and Morgen derive. All the more so because the name Modron in the triad is appropriate to the role of a Welsh water-goddess,<sup>10</sup> whereas Morgen seems to be the inept substitution of a man's name by the Bretons,<sup>11</sup> from whom Geoffrey and the French romances drew so much of Arthurian material, more or less directly. If we allow time for a Breton development of this Welsh tradition to take place before the appearance of Morgen in the *Vita Merlini* (ca. 1150), it is safe to say that the original tradition of a personal Avallach must have been current in Wales at least as early as 1100. The hypothesis which seems to reconcile all the facts is this: Welsh legends concerning an *Ynis Avallach* lie behind the *insula Avallonis*; two schools of interpretation already existed early in the twelfth century concerning the meaning of Avallach; one, possibly correct, derived it from the common noun *afallach*, meaning an orchard; the other recognized a king of this name and provided him with descendants; Geoffrey's form *Avallonis* is probably, like most of his Arthurian nomenclature, drawn from Breton-French sources<sup>12</sup> and has been influenced by the place-name Avallon.

The date of *Perlesvaus* Nitze discusses with learning and acumen. He is less positive than heretofore in assigning the year 1212 as a *terminus ad quem* for the second redaction. In general the position adopted seems sound, and I may refer to my review of Carman for my own impressions on this difficult matter.<sup>13</sup>

In Chapter IV, Nitze is doubtless right in asserting the influence on *Perlesvaus* of Chrétien's, Pseudo-Wauchier's, and Wauchier's sections of the *Conte del Graal*. The argument for a lost source for the Chapel Ride in *Perlesvaus* and in Johannes Glastoniensis seems convincing, as also for the Coward Knight motif in *Perlesvaus* and Manessier. We must resort to the same explanation for the common features in *Perlesvaus* and Boron's *Joseph*. Surely Boron was drawing on antecedent documents, and Nitze himself notes

6. Cf. p. 49: "Avalloc, qui ibidem cum suis filiabus . . . fertur inhabitasse."

7. Ed. J. J. Parry, Urbana, Ill., 1925, p. 84: "Exceditque suas forma prestante sorores. Morgen ei nomen."

8. L. A. Paton, *Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, Boston, 1903, p. 46: "Immodice Iesus Arturus tendit ad aulam Regis Avallonis, ubi virgo regia . . ."

9. Ed. Paris and Ulrich, Paris, 1886, I, 201 f.: "Li rois Uriens de Garlot fist nueces grans et miervilleuses. . . Et la premiere nuit qu'il gieut avec Morgain engendra il Yvain le fil au roi Urien."

10. J. Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures* (1887), p. 28 f.

11. R. S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, New York, 1927, p. 192 f.; *MP*, xxxiii (1936), 233 f.; Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 267 and n. 1.

12. *MP*, xxxiii, 234 f.; *R*, xxv, 2.

13. *RR*, xxviii (1937), 351.

(page 122) that the seven years' service of Joseph of Arimathea does not occur in Boron, but in *Perlesvaus* and the *Vulgate Estoire*, and therefore implies some common source. Nitze's conclusion that Gerbert de Montreuil drew his account of the Knight of the Dragon from *Perlesvaus* fits in with my own suspicions. Of course, I accept the parallel between the isle of the ageless elders and Caer Siddi, which I was the first to point out<sup>14</sup> and on which I have offered some supplementary evidence in *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 428 f.

With the other efforts to detect the Celtic background of *Perlesvaus* I am in hearty sympathy. The pursuit of the Questing Beast to her lair has been most successful (page 134 ff.), and the interpretation of the Beheading Test (page 166 ff.) seems convincing, except in so far as the analogy of the Killing of the God in Mexico (page 283) leads Nitze to presuppose an ultimate source in ritual. There is no trace of ritual in the Irish versions of the Beheading Test. The connection of the Black Knight's lance with the Luin of Celtchar (page 217) seems plausible, and likewise the identification of Gurgaran with Gwrnach Gawr (page 249).

But I wish that Nitze had taken the opportunity to give a complete account of Celtic tradition in *Perlesvaus*. For his omission he will doubtless win plaudits from those who believe Geoffrey of Monmouth to be the father of Arthurian romance. But others will be disappointed that his own masterly study of the Grail Castle and his identification of the Grail King with Bran the Blessed are merely listed in the bibliography. I trust I may be pardoned if I note a number of other Celtic connections which have been overlooked. The adventure of Cahus is obviously based on the *conteur* formula of the ill-success of Kay;<sup>15</sup> the black-letter texts recognize the fact by using the common form *Keux*.<sup>16</sup> The Chastel des Puceles has demonstrable connections with the Isle of Maidens in the *imrama*.<sup>17</sup> The bridges of the Grail Castle seem to be cognate with the perilous bridges leading to Scáthach's isle in the *Foghlaim Conculainn*.<sup>18</sup> The episode of Marin le Jalos and his son Meliot seems to derive ultimately from the begetting of Llew.<sup>19</sup> The victory of Perceval over the Chevalier au Dragon and his conquest of the Chastel del Tor de Cuvre are surely elaborations of the story told in *Fouke Fitz Warin* of Dinas Bran.<sup>20</sup> That the author meant by "Tor" a bull, not a tower, is

14. Nitze is mistaken in assigning (p. 151) priority to Rhys, who on the pages cited makes no mention of the *Perlesvaus* whatever. Nitze is also in error (p. 155) in giving the Welsh reading for Glass Fort as *Caer Wydryn*; it is *Caer Wydyr*. It is incorrect to say (p. 340) that I identify the knight in the "tonel de voirre" with Gwair. The references show that I identify Gwair with the unseen but audible prisoner in the "fosse" (I. 9602 f.).

15. *MLN*, XLIII (1928), 218.

16. Vol. I, 412.

17. *R*, LIX (1933), 560-562.

18. *R*, LXIII (1937), 386 f.

19. *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 432 ff.

20. *Kastner Miscellany*, p. 342 ff. *Fouke* is not, of course, the source of *Perlesvaus*.

shown, first, by the use of the masculine (*li tors*) in MS P, which Nitze declares to be the most reliable,<sup>21</sup> and by the form *le torel* in MS Br, which cannot mean anything but bull-calf; secondly, by the fact that the *tor braoit* or *bruioit* as bulls, but not towers, are wont to do; thirdly, by the common recognition by medieval folk of bovine images as objects of pagan worship;<sup>22</sup> and finally, by the correspondence with the story of the *tor* (bull) *d'or* in *Fouke*. In the face of these facts Nitze's apparent preference for the meaning "tower," which is supported only by MSS inferior to P, and for which there are no close analogies in medieval literature, is hard to understand. (The automata he rightly derives from one or more works cited by Bruce and Spargo.) As I have noted elsewhere,<sup>23</sup> though the author of *Perlesvaus* had in mind a bull, this *tor* was probably introduced at an earlier stage in the development of the story through a misreading of *cor*, and the whole tradition went back to the Horn of Bran, which is at the bottom of much else that is most perplexing in the Grail cycle. Other talismans from the Welsh list of the Thirteen Treasures of the Isle of Britain appear in *Perlesvaus*: the Sword, the Chess-board, and the Platter, which is the nearest prototype of the Grail itself.<sup>24</sup> Though the folktale origin of the Maidens of the Wells is clearly recognized (page 163), their Welsh nationality—if one may apply the word to fays—is unnoticed.<sup>25</sup> In an article appearing after the publication of this book I have shown grounds for identifying the Roi du Chastel Mortel with King Amangon of the *Elucidation* and ultimately with Welsh Manawydan.<sup>26</sup>

The ignoring of this Celtic evidence leads occasionally to what I am bound to consider misinterpretation. For instance, Nitze attributes (page 165) the complex phases of the Damsel of the Cart to the author's conflation of Chrétien's Grail-bearer, his Loathly Messenger, and the allegorical figures of Fortune and the Church Militant. He is doubtless right in attributing these two latter aspects to the author, but the identification of the Loathly Messenger with the Grail-bearer was traditional; it is found in *Peredur* and can be traced back to a remote Irish prototype, the Sovranty of Erin, whose loathly aspect is described in very similar terms to those used in *Peredur* and who in her lovelier form serves the visiting hero with drink in the palace of the god Lug.<sup>27</sup> The other peculiarities of this composite lady in *Perlesvaus* may likewise find their explanation in the Irish goddess Liban, who goads Cúchulainn by her reproaches to undertake a journey, and elsewhere rides in a chariot drawn by stags.<sup>28</sup> The Damsel of the Cart, then, not only has her

21. Pages 21, 316.

22. *PMLA*, LI (1936), 15.

23. *Kastner Miscellany*, p. 344 ff.

24. *Romanische Forschungen*, XLV (1931), 68 ff. *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 430.

25. *Rev. Celtique*, XLVII (1930), 48 ff.

26. *R*, LXIII (1937), 389 f.

27. *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 421 f.

28. *Rev. Celtique*, XLVII (1930), 60 ff.



recent allegorical roles to fill, but has inherited from remote antiquity features and functions of two Irish divinities.

The chapter on structure and style seems admirable in its appreciation of the rhythmic sentences, the richly pictorial effects, the general organization, the control of the multiple threads of the narrative. I wonder, however, whether the use of the term *sententia* on page 161 is justified, and I do not find *dissimulatio* (page 162) listed among the many "colours of rethorike" listed in Faral's collection. In fact, I should question whether in these prose romances much attention was paid to the rhetoric of the schools. It is noteworthy that the famous description of Ysolt cited by Brunetto Latini as a model is found in no MS of the *Prose Tristan* but was probably composed to fit the prescription.<sup>29</sup>

A few titles which one might add to the imposing bibliography are these: Golther's *Parzival und der Gral in der Dichtung des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*; Joseph A. Robinson's essay on the *De Antiquitate* in his *Somerset Archaeological Essays*; J. Rhys's *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*, for its discussion of the Twrch Trwyth; Mary Williams' contribution to the *Mélanges offerts à M. J. Loth* (Rennes, 1927); and Helaine Newstead's "The Joie de la Cort Episode in Erec and the Horn of Bran," *PMLA*, LI (1936), 13. Professor Williams, it may be remarked, has just published in *Folklore*, XLVIII (1937), 263, an interesting note "Apropos of an Episode in *Perlesvaus*."

The completion of this searching and comprehensive study makes one wish for a briefer account of this fascinating romance on a different plan, tracing the growth of the Grail tradition from its late Celtic forms through the *Conte del Graal* and the more Christianized forms, and the final shaping of the whole and the individual motifs by the genius of the author. Who would be more fitted for the task than Professor Nitze himself, who has devoted so much of his life to searching the mysteries of the Grail?

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

Columbia University

*La Poésie française en Catalogne du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup>. Etudes suivies de textes inédits ou publiés d'après les manuscrits avec 5 planches hors texte.* Par AMÉDÉE PAGÈS. Toulouse, Edouard Privat; Paris, Henri Didier, 1936. Pp. xii + 392.

In little more than a quarter of a century M. Amédée Pagès has become the best known authority outside of Catalonia itself on Catalan poetry of the classical period. In addition to shorter studies in the form of articles that have appeared in *Romania*, *Annales du Midi*, *Estudis Universitaris Catalans*, etc., he has brought out such important works as *Auzias March et ses prédécesseurs* (1912), *Les obres d'Auzias March* (2 vols., 1912-1914), *Commentaire des poésies d'Auzias March* (1925), *Andreae Capellani . . . de amore*

29. E. G. Gardner, *Arthurian Legend in Italian Literature*, London, 1930, p. 39 f.



*libri tres* (the Latin text with a fourteenth-century Catalan translation with an excellent introduction, 1930), and *Les cobles de Jacme, Pere i Arnau March* (1934). Partly as a crowning achievement to all this activity, it would seem, and thanks also to the specific encouragement of M. Alfred Jeanroy (page xii), the present work has been compiled to show that Catalan lyric poetry, admittedly greatly indebted in its beginnings to the songs of the troubadours, is by no means the exclusive product of continued inspiration coming from the South of France, as has been frequently thought and even categorically affirmed, but that, on the contrary, during the period of greatest flourishing of classical Catalan literature from about the middle of the second half of the fourteenth century down to the beginning of the period of decline around 1450-1460, it reflects to a high degree the art of the minstrels and poets of Northern France.

The short first chapter of the "Première partie" contributes little to the general purpose of the book: in it are recalled some half dozen isolated instances of traces, some of them doubtful, of contact between the literature of Catalonia and that of Northern France from about 1200 to the accession to the throne of Pere IV in 1335. The second chapter covers the period of gradual diffusion of French influence in Catalonia, an influence which, in Pagès' opinion, eventually becomes paramount, destined in turn to fade rather suddenly before, on the one hand, the rising vogue of the Italians in the Peninsula and, on the other hand, the inevitable process of Castilianisation that set in with the coming of Fernando I and his successors. Pere IV, lover of "ceremonies" and patron of poets, whose reign extended down to 1387, was a francophile; and this francophilia was inherited and intensified by his son Joan, who while still a prince married, in 1380, Yolande de Bar, a niece of the French king. Numerous are the documents which show that during the reigns of these two monarchs and also that of Martin I (†1410) French books (manuscripts) circulated widely and French *jongleurs*, minstrels, choristers, and particularly musicians flocked to the Aragonese courts at Saragossa and Barcelona. Naturally, these *jongleurs*, etc., carried in their baggage French compositions of various sorts, and it is this repertoire, "possible ou réel," that is discussed in Chapter III: it seems to have been composed of songs, "balades," rondeaus, virelais, and "lais lyriques," but apparently no "chansons de geste." Firm in the conviction that a certain Jean d'Arras known to have received 30 florins at Barcelona in August, 1380, is none other than the author of the *Roman de Mélusine*, Pagès devotes his next chapter, with four plates containing illustrations reproduced from a Paris manuscript, to a general discussion of the novel, with emphasis on the accuracy of details in that part of it whose scene of action is Catalonia, voicing toward the end a natural surprise that the novel itself should not, as it seems, have been known in Catalonia at that time. The fifth and last chapter of the "Première partie" tells of the popularity in Catalonia of Guillaume de Machaut (as early as 1380), Oton de Granson, and Alain Chartier (particularly through his *Belle*

*Dame sans merci*, translated into Catalan in the fifteenth century by Catalonia's "Macias," Francesch Oliver)—precisely the three poets "d'una semença" (Rocabertí) whom, as Pagès is probably right in thinking, Fra Rocabertí (*Gloria d'amor*, vv. 744-761) represents as being beaten on several scores ("per diverses pertides") by Petrarch.

This first part is largely a repetition and development of finds that had already been reported, and Pagès has given full credit to all those from whom he has borrowed. It is in the "Deuxième partie" that the author makes a contribution which is almost exclusively his own. Here, in four chapters devoted respectively to "La Ballade et le chant royal," "Le Virelai," "Le Rondeau," and "Le Lai lyrique," he carefully analyzes the technique of these various genres as used by Guillaume de Machaut, Oton de Granson, Eustache Deschamps, and Charles d'Orléans, and quotes examples of their use by Catalan poets from around 1400 on, these examples being probably, as he admits on page 165, only a part of what was written or could perhaps be found. Pagès seems not to be always on sure footing in this part of his work, for he finds that, on the one hand, the Catalan poets did not always adhere strictly to the rules and that, on the other hand, he has to "edit" certain compositions already in print in order to make them conform to the norms which he proposes for them. Moreover, he is obliged to recognize as operative, more and more so toward the end of the period which he is studying, the attraction not only of such neighboring forms as the Provençal "dansa" and "descort," but also of the Castilian "villancico."

That the reader may have before him illustrations of both parts of his study, Pagès then gives 173 pages of texts, with critical apparatus. Section I of these texts consists of 23 poems or fragments of poems in French from a manuscript executed in Catalonia and preserved in the Biblioteca de Catalunya, Barcelona (Massó Torrents' H<sup>b</sup>). Of these, nine are here printed for the first time. Though there may be those who will be thankful for the inedita, the inclusion of these 23 pieces in the book is not easy to justify: its *raison d'être*, so one may infer from a little digression on pages 92-93 (to which there is a cross-reference on page 171), seems to be to make more readily accessible a document, so to speak, from which some properly qualified person may "extraire, avec un peu de patience, un petit traité de la prononciation française au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle." Section II is a hitherto unpublished fragment (the manuscript breaks off after the first verse of stanza 11) of an anonymous Catalan translation of *La Belle Dame sans merci*. Sections III, IV, V, and VI contain samples of the handling by Catalan poets of the "ballade" (6), the virelai (3), the rondeau (1), and the "lai lyrique" (14) respectively.

As an appendix, three interesting "Notes additionnelles à la I<sup>re</sup> Partie, Chapitre V" ("La Joya de desconaxença de la enamorada et la Belle Dame sans merci," "Romeu Lull et la Belle Dame sans merci," and "Les amours tragiques de Francesch Oliver") close the volume.

As stated in the "Conclusion" (just preceding the texts) of this "double enquête," as the author himself calls it, it is mainly with matters of prosody that Pagès is concerned in this work. Earlier in the volume (page 107) he announces: "La ressemblance des cadres importera plus pour nous que celle des idées." It is refreshing to find a question of literary influence convincingly worked out, not primarily by the more or less conventional method of pointing out analogies in thought content and identities or parallels in phraseology, style, etc., but, after due attention to historical documentation, by the more objective study of an external aspect common to the two literatures involved.

H. C. HEATON

New York University

*La Mesnardière's Poétique (1639): Sources and Dramatic Theories.* By HELEN REESE REESE. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. 241.

A brief Introduction (pages 11-13) states the purpose of the study, gives a survey of the little that has been written about La Mesnardière and indicates his importance as author of the "first commentary in French on the *Poetics* of Aristotle." In this Introduction La Mesnardière is represented as having been interested in the theory rather than in the practice of the dramatic art; he illustrates the theories with examples taken from Greek and Latin tragedies, Spanish and Italian plays and from a tragedy of his own (*Alinde*), but does not cite the plays of his contemporaries as the Abbé d'Aubignac was to do a few years later in his *Pratique du théâtre*.

Chapter one deals with the Life and Works of the theorist. This includes a brief discussion of his works, and an account of the circumstances attending their composition and publication, his relations with his contemporaries and their judgments concerning him,—in short, all that one would need to know except perhaps for one rather unfortunate omission. In taking up the study of a Commentary of Aristotle which was to be illustrated by examples taken from Greek and Latin tragedies one would like to know at the beginning something of its author's preparation for the task which he has undertaken. We are told on the first page of the Introduction that Mesnardière "reproduced the mistakes" of an earlier commentator. On page 21 of the Chapter on the Life and Works a letter of Chapelain is cited: *Le livre traite de l'art poétique selon la doctrine d'Aristote qu'il a recueillie de ce qu'il en a leu dans Scaliger le père et dans Heinsius. C'est une chose assés merveilleuse qu'un médecin qui n'entend point trop bien le latin et à qui les langues italienne et espagnole ne sont connues que labies ténus, qui n'abonde point en jugement . . . soit devenu tout d'un coup poète, et non seulement cela, mais encore maistre des poètes par les règles qu'il leur donne de la poésie, et qu'il leur donne plus agréablement et plus solidement qu'aucun n'ait fait en France jusques icy.* On page 63 Miss Reese, in a footnote, cites Egger as saying that

"at times the theorist was content simply to translate Aristotle although the last words (in the definition of tragedy) are not in accord with the meaning of the original." In view of these and other rather haphazard indications one hardly knows how to take the statement in the Conclusion (page 219): "The critic shows a fairly good knowledge of the classics," although the statement is fortified by the citation of seven Greek and Latin authors with whose works La Mesnardière seems to have had some acquaintance.

Chapter two deals with the *Discours* which precedes *La Poétique*. In this *Discours*: "La Mesnardière shows his reverence for Poetry, his adoration of the ancients, his cult of Aristotle, his disapproval of Castelvetro and his desire to give to French poets a usable *Art poétique* written in their own language." The two chapters following are concerned with *La Poétique* itself.

Miss Reese follows the same method for all three parts. She takes up each point as it comes in the text, states it quite completely in her own language—there are very few direct quotations from the text itself—and then proceeds to supply it with a very liberal documentation in the footnotes which, in their fine print take up not far from fifty per cent of the entire space. This is the outstanding feature of the work for Miss Reese has done more than she promised to do in the first sentence of her Introduction: "The purpose of this study is to present the dramatic theories of La Mesnardière and to attempt to determine their sources." The author has indeed presented the theories, determined their sources and supplied a convenient catalogue, at least of principal sources, in the Conclusion. In addition she has given a great many citations from contemporary critics and men of letters—Corneille, Chapelain, Scudéry, Sarasin and others—which are apparently not to be taken as sources, but as parallel passages revealing contemporary opinion upon the points treated by her author. There results from them a vivid impression of the state of mind, in respect to the theater, which prevailed in Paris around 1639. It may well be one of the most valuable features of Miss Reese's work.

It is unfortunate that the composition has been, or seems to have been, either too hurriedly done, or at least not revised with sufficient care. This is especially noticeable in the first Chapter on the Life and Works of La Mesnardière. On page 30, the first paragraph begins with the statement that "La Mesnardière abandoned poetry temporarily for an attack upon Chapelain." It ends with the statement that: "The *procès* between the publishers Somaville and Courbé was decided in favor of the latter." But I can find no explanation of what this *procès* was, nor how it was connected with the "attack upon Chapelain." The next paragraph (page 31) refers to "the conspiracy against Chapelain" but gives no indication whether the "conspiracy" preceded the "attack," or whether it was the "attack," or whether it grew out of the "attack." All that we learn about "the conspiracy against Chapelain" from the rest of the paragraph is that Chapelain wrote a reply to an anonymous letter by La Mesnardière, that Conrart wrote some *Remarques*

in favor of Chapelain, that neither of these writings was published and that "The quarrel ended in the victory of Chapelain."

On pages 35 and 36 we read of the founding of the *Académie bachique* and of the members who attended it. Toward the end of the passage we are told that: "The second meeting of that year (1658) was dedicated to a celebration of the return of La Mesnardière to the fold and his reconciliation with Costar. Claudine Colletet decided the question in favor of the latter." After repeated readings of what goes before and what comes after I would be unwilling to hazard the vaguest guess as to what could have been "the question."

The writing of the most important part of the work, the three chapters on the *Discours* and *La Poétique*, is much clearer but it is marred by inadvertencies which could very easily have been avoided; for example:

He [La Mesnardière] imagines an emperor paying homage to tragedy, the queen, in the presence of princes and justifying his life at the foot of this tribunal which is well acquainted with the actions of rulers; (page 45 f.)

He [the poet] should know that the principal shortcomings of writers consist in using things [!] which are unreasonable, shocking, contradictory, impossible, and against art. (page 83.)

Menelaus is . . . so brutal as to speak injuries to Agamemnon because he has difficulty in signing the death of his daughter. (page 120.)

Although many readers would have preferred the entire text of La Mesnardière in spite of the verbosity of its five hundred odd pages, Miss Reese has performed a valuable service for students of French seventeenth-century drama in making accessible a work which has been often cited but never presented with any satisfactory fullness. *La Poétique* is important not only for what it reveals of literary ideals prevalent in France around 1640 but because it indicates trends which were to receive a rich development later. Lack of space limits us to one example but that in itself should be sufficient to justify the assertion. In common with Chapelain and Corneille, La Mesnardière out-Aristotled Aristotle in the time limitation of action; he "praises the poet who can arrange the incidents of the tragedy in the same number of hours as are needed for their representation, provided such an arrangement does not cause any confusion or obscurity" (page 81). But, even as Corneille, he will be more liberal, "If it is impossible to avoid confusion by this restriction, the poet is permitted to extend the time to a day or even a little longer" (Ibid.).

On the other hand La Mesnardière insists that *le mouvement des passions* is "the dominant element (*l'essence du théâtre*) which should be the first object of the dramatic writer" (page 91). He calls the stage "the throne of the passions" (page 86) then repeats and enlarges upon this characterization by adding (page 182) that: "the fame and success of the poet depend principally upon passions well expressed." The theorist goes on to say that "it must be inferred that tumultuous passions exclude artificiality of form"; that "An affected style is very inappropriate to *agitations de l'âme*, which keep no rules in their violent outbursts"; and that: "Metaphorical terms have marvelous

grace in poetic language but they do not seem fitting to depict accurately the natural behavior of passions, which is so spontaneous that there is no time to search for unusual expressions." He concludes with a sentence reminiscent of a famous *Pensée* of Pascal: "Therefore, he [the poet] must enter into the thoughts and passions of his characters so as to make them pass, by way of the actor, into the mind of his auditor" (pages 189-191).

COLBERT SEARLES

University of Minnesota

*Man and Beast in French Thought of the Eighteenth Century.* By HESTER HASTINGS. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1936. Pp. 297.

Never before has the eighteenth-century development of humanitarianism towards animals been studied in the French field. Dr. Hastings has written a most readable book, outstanding for the thoroughness of its documentation. *Man and Beast* continues where Professor Boas' *The Happy Beast in French Thought of the Seventeenth Century* ends.

Part One (the briefest) traces the growth in the eighteenth century of belief in "The Souls of Beasts." But "the real crux of the problem" was the question of "Man's Essential Superiority to the Brute." Part Two demonstrates that before the close of the century man no longer tended to feel different from animals in essence, but merely in degree of physical perfection, and hence of mental activity. The third and lengthiest part of the book treats "The Antecedents of Practical Humanitarianism." Not only pity for the suffering of animals, but also rationalized objections to cruel treatment of them were fostered by the new opinion of animal nature. Although the *Loi Grégoire*, the first bill to curb mistreatment of animals in France, was not passed until 1850, the close of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth century thus saw the beginning of serious agitation in that direction.

That the eighteenth century marks "the definite change<sup>1</sup> in man's attitude toward animals" (page 16); that the contest between defender of man and of beast was waged between theologian and *libertin*<sup>2</sup> (page 15); that "the humanitarian movement in behalf of animals in France has its roots more deeply in serious philosophical and ethical concerns than in mere sentimentality" (page 281); and that the century's animal literature, as compared with that of the years to follow, is on the whole neither highly imaginative nor artistic (page 281)—these are among Dr. Hastings' conclusions.

There is no reason to doubt the fundamental thesis that the whole controversy, particularly the eighteenth-century concept of an animal as a creature just a link below man in the chain of being, proved effective in the campaign

1. One should recall that the transition between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a gradual one. The Cartesian was not the sole position in the age of Descartes. Even before Bayle, Gassendi claimed that beast and man differ only in degree.

2. The statement is an over-simplification. There were theologians on both sides of the dispute as to whether or not animals have souls.



to enforce better treatment of animals. And yet a few words of caution! It is acknowledged (page 177) that the literary-philosophic movement was but one of the determining factors, albeit an important one. Making the point at the outset would have been conducive to greater clarity. Furthermore, the practical aspect of the question of the treatment of animals is not always clearly enough distinguished from the ideological. The author well remarks that "people always possessed pet animals" (page 205). Elsewhere she would have profited by recalling her wise distinction (made on the same page) between life and literature, instead of permitting the implication that the literary defense of animals typified progress in popular practice. Such is the ascendancy of sentiment over reason in daily life that a very Descartes kept a pet dog, which he evidently cherished! Nor is an age of legislation necessarily a period which witnesses the strictest acceptance and observance of the law in question. At times, acts are passed at the moment of greatest popular abuse; the necessity for the *Loi Granmont* might indicate to some an increasing popular cruelty to animals rather than the converse. Since social legislation really developed only in the nineteenth century, the fact that France had, before 1850, no humanitarian bill concerning animals need not mean that the nineteenth century became more solicitous about their welfare than any previous epoch.

In justice to Descartes, it should be pointed out that there is no more scientific proof in the eighteenth century for the existence of animal soul than in the seventeenth century for its non-existence. Miss Hastings deems the eighteenth-century view "more scientific" than Descartes', because, through discoveries of anatomic and organic similarities, it clarified the fact that man is an animal (page 67). The seventeenth-century physiologists recognized the same resemblance, and Descartes, who would have it that beasts are machines, proposed at the same time that the human body is a machine. A more physiological conception of soul rather than additional knowledge of physiology brought the eighteenth century to discard the Cartesian view.

One may differ with Dr. Hastings' judgment in choosing Boullier's attitude toward animal nature rather than Bayle's as characteristic of the century,<sup>3</sup> but that is mostly a matter of opinion; her statements of fact are with minor exceptions<sup>4</sup> accurate. The lack of pedantry is admirable in one who has rendered so valuable a service through the compilation of an excellent bibliography. The growth of humanitarianism toward animals interests the author perhaps

3. Her own evidence seems to show that Boullier's definition of animal soul as spiritual was not so current as Bayle's, which, making no attempt to keep within the Cartesian dualism, found it easy to concede to beasts intelligence without spirituality.

4. "Bonnet alone in France . . ." (p. 279). Bonnet was Swiss, not French. "The reply to Barbe" (p. 24, n. 4) should read "the reply of Barbe." "Since the 18th century reveals little sentimentality in French literature . . ." (p. 252). The statement may be true of animal literature, but it is not tenable for the century's literature in general. "The 18th century discovered animals too late to celebrate them in *belles-lettres* . . ." (p. 281). The author should make it clearer what is meant by *belles-lettres*. On the face of it, the statement is an apparent contradiction to a great deal of her evidence.



more than do the general theories underlying the controversy. One would have preferred in the Conclusion more analysis of the significance of the data in relation to the movement of ideas, and a full discussion of unformulated problems inherent in the findings, even where no definitive answer was forthcoming.

Such questions include the extent to which eighteenth-century animal literature is indicative both of the early growth of the romantic movement and of the continuance of a classical tradition. Was the praise of animals at the expense of man symbolic of primitivism and anti-intellectualism? What were the relationships between the controversy on the moral nature of beasts and the evolution of ethics in the eighteenth century? Did the general problem of the nature of animals prove influential in revising definitions of soul, or *vice versa*? Was animal mechanism rejected on the merits, or as a result of anti-Cartesian pressure? Did inquiry concerning animal behavior affect work in animal physiology and psychology, and did such studies alter eighteenth-century attitudes toward the problem? Was the campaign for the prevention of cruelty to animals (part of the general humanitarian movement of the age) at all linked with revolutionary demands for the rights of the oppressed?

Dr. Hastings' book proves the extent to which her subject is of interest today. *Man and Beast* will serve as valuable guide for further studies in a difficult field. The treatments which the author promises of the general topic in eighteenth-century England and Germany and nineteenth-century France will be eagerly awaited.

LEONORA COHEN ROSENFELD

Brooklyn College

---

*Citizen of Geneva: Selections from the Letters of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.* By C. W. HENDEL. New York, Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. 405.

One of the great literary events of the past decade was the completion in 1934 of the publication, in twenty volumes, of Rousseau's correspondence. Professor Hendel's *Citizen of Geneva* is the first English translation of a selection from these letters. "This collection," the Preface states, "contains the letters whose thought is of intrinsic value and others, too, which reveal 'the authentic Rousseau.'" Controversial letters dealing with Rousseau's unhappy quarrels with some of his friends are therefore omitted. The omission may be accepted, but not on the grounds stated by the author. Yet "lest the book seem nothing but an apology for Rousseau," a biographical sketch of one hundred and twenty-three pages introduces the anthology. The author would have the reader believe that the sketch comes in large part from the complete correspondence rather than from the patient efforts of such Rousseau scholars and enthusiasts as Mr. Hendel himself. Rousseau's weaknesses and manias are here freely admitted. The biography perpetuates many of the assumptions

accepted by Rousseau's admirers but based on evidence that is far from complete.<sup>1</sup> Moreover the selection of letters remains none the less an apology for Rousseau, and therein lies its chief merit.

The reader will find in this anthology an authentic Rousseau, as human as he is lovable. The long letters to Malesherbes in which he tries so sincerely to understand himself must be classified among the world's greatest epistles. And he is most human and most lovable in those letters written to intimate friends in which he speaks of the most trivial matters. Then, too, there are letters which help to explain his published works. One can see, he says, from reading the *Social Contract* that he "never approved of the democratic form of government" (page 343). To Cramer he writes that *Emile* is not a *Treatise on Education* at all but rather "a quite philosophical work on the principle advanced by the author in other writings, that *man is naturally good*" (page 296).

Rousseau explains his epistolary style: "I want to be free, incorrect, inconsequential in my letters as in my conversation." The inaccuracies, not alarming in the original French, have of course disappeared in translation. Many of the inconsistencies still remain. In a very important letter on his religious beliefs he writes: "So I have abandoned reason to its fate, and consulted nature, that is to say, the internal sentiment which directs my belief independently of my reason" (page 147). It is eight months later at least and to a different correspondent that he asserts that "the common authority is that of reason. I recognize no other." How Voltairean he sounds when he says again: "I may be wrong. But what am I to do in this matter? I can only use my own head to reason" (page 186). It all depends on whether he is arguing *for* immortality in one instance, or *against* the Manichaeans in the other. And that, we must admit, is a most convenient arrangement. Yet in these letters such inconsistencies seem more pardonable.

Mr. Hendel is interested primarily in Rousseau the moralist, and especially the Platonic moralist. He would show how Rousseau's moral conflicts and weaknesses were refined into final moral victory. To those of us whose ethic

1. Diderot's remark in *The Natural Son* that "only the bad are solitary" seems certainly not to have been directed at Rousseau, in spite of Hendel's insinuations (pp. 18, 25, 114). It was an integral part of the philosophy of his *Pensées Philosophiques*, published ten years before Rousseau decided to become a hermit. It was not a personal matter, but one of fundamental philosophical disagreement. Likewise, too little is known of the break between Rousseau and his friends, Mme D'Epinay, Grimm, and Diderot, to warrant even tacit conclusions. Rousseau admits in his letters (p. 179) that he has one sin—even "some sins"—to expiate in print before he dies. One has the uneasy feeling that he perhaps did not expiate them all (p. 78), just as he failed to write that apologetic letter to Saint-Lambert which he promised Diderot he would write. Diderot can hardly then be taken to task for "revelations" which he had every reason to believe were not revelations at all (p. 33). Mr. Hendel uses remarkable restraint in dealing with Voltaire. There are no diatribes against "Voltaire and company." Yet he makes no attempt to seek Voltaire's motive in lending his pen, in the libellous *Sentiments of the Citizens*, to accusations that he could only have obtained from Rousseau's former friends, Jacob Vernet, or Dr. Tronchin, whose veracity he could hardly suspect. An unmotivated despicable act should not lightly be charged to any man, even Voltaire.

principles do not stem so definitely from the Platonic, the thesis will seem hardly tenable. There will appear even in the selected letters more than one example of questionable ethical judgment and pompous preaching, while Rousseau's Platonism will seem more a biological accident than a well-defined and consciously accepted ethical theory. As early as 1760 his letters show him weary of intellectual combat, and the following years witness a rapid withdrawal from social conflict (page 177). From 1770 on he is living in a world of cats, canaries and flowers. It is difficult to conceive as an ethical victory the retirement from human society with reference to which alone moral science has meaning.

Both in genuine literary merit and as a human document the *Correspondence*, at least in selection, is superior to the *Confessions*, and that is no mean praise. Mr. Hendel's great service has been to reduce the somewhat forbidding twenty volumes to a unified artistic whole. Many of the later letters contain all the glories of the *Reveries* and few of them are written with the rhetorical bombast that is so annoying at times in the *Confessions*. The reader of the *Correspondence*, and especially of this anthology, must perforce admit that Rousseau was a good man. His reiterated statement that no man was ever better than he, can be forgiven in the light of his defense of an egocentricity as complete as that of Professor Bergeret's Riquet (page 272). It is apparent that those who have disliked his ideas made a great mistake in trying to discredit them because of his personal immorality. Let them admit that he was good—not virtuous, for the word "virtue" means *force*, he explains (page 264)—and that he was great. Then his ideas may be discussed according to their merits. But above all, if they are still tempted to speak unkindly of the man Rousseau, Mr. Hendel's *Citizen of Geneva* should be obligatory reading.

NORMAN L. TORREY

Columbia University

---

*The Subject of Realism in the "Revue des Deux Mondes" (1831-1865).* By THADDEUS ERNEST DU VAL, JR. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1936. Pp. 149.

For many years before realism had grown to the proportions of a movement, the ideas which its disciples were to set up as laws were already in circulation and waiting for a Courbet or a Champfleury to codify them. Dr. Du Val has included this period in his study. He has sought to indicate what precisely was the contribution of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* to the campaign waged against realism, from the time when this periodical first began to take a serious interest in things literary, to the year when *Germinie Lacerteux* announced still another literary movement.

This thesis is at once a description of the varying attitude of the *Revue* towards realism as a mode of art and a study in semantic change, for the author shows in his first chapter the different uses of the word during the years in

question. At first "realism" was taken to mean the "literal imitation of reality," or was used where today we would say "materialism." In both cases the influence of the critic Gustave Planche was considerable, for he, like Victor Cousin, deplored the absence of "une pensée" and of spiritual beauty in works of art. Planche did not, however, antedate Cousin as the author implies (page 25), since the contributions of Cousin to the philosophy of spiritualism are dated as early as 1818. Other traits associated with realism were impassibility and a subsequent amorality, lack of discrimination in the choice of details and the failure to idealize through the sacrifice of some details and the exaggeration of others. Vulgarity and the depiction of *bas-milieux* were added to this list after the middle of the century.

Since the movement was often regarded as being essentially democratic and opposed to the established order, the author points out in his second chapter that the policy of the *Revue* towards realism was dictated, in a large measure, by its political sympathies; when conservative in politics, it was conservative in literature. In the next three chapters Dr. Du Val examines specifically the periodical's reaction towards realism in painting, in the novel and in the drama. He then concludes with a few pages from which it appears that the *Revue* made important concessions to realism during the years 1855-1865. Not only did the critical staff become less severe, but writers who were in sympathy with the new movement contributed to the publication. The author surmises that these concessions, which he attributes to political liberalism, do not indicate a genuine liking for realism, but rather an unwilling surrender on the part of the *Revue* to a movement which had become firmly established.

Dr. Du Val's general ideas are sound, for his work is well documented and he has profited by the studies of M. P. Martino<sup>1</sup> and of M. E. Bouvier.<sup>2</sup> One may, on the other hand, dispute points of detail. For example, implying that critics writing around 1830 would know what precise meaning the word "realism" was to take on a quarter of a century later, the author writes (page 114) of "Planche's erroneous reference to Hugo and Dumas père as realists which was caused by the critic's still vague conception of what the term really meant." Again in his chapter on "Concessions to Realism (1855-1865)" Dr. Du Val cites the case of Planche whose admiration in 1856 for David d'Angers's *Philopoemen* "is opposed theoretically to his esthetic principles" (pages 136-137). And yet it might have been observed that the same admiration was expressed by Planche in an article on this statue dated 1837.<sup>3</sup> These, however, are but minor faults which do not seriously mar the general impression of conscientious research.

CLAUDE P. VIENS

Brown University

1. *Le Roman réaliste sous le Second Empire*, Paris, Hachette, 1913.

2. *La Bataille réaliste*, Paris, Fontemoing, 1913.

3. "La Statue de Philopoemen, de David," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, October 15, 1837.

*Meredith et la France.* Par MONA E. MACKAY. Paris, Boivin, 1937. Pp. 296.

This book reopens a fascinating question. What was the internationally active virus which made so many later nineteenth-century writers uncomfortable at home, no matter where home happened to be? Flaubert's manifest discontent among the contemporary bourgeois and Henry James' preference for urbane England over vulgar America are familiar. Now Dr. Mackay brings up the case of Meredith, not only discontent with England but preaching the virtues of French culture to the English and playing whimsically with the idea of spending his old age where the sale of his books made him feel he would be better appreciated—in the United States.<sup>1</sup> Truly, to these men the far off hills were indeed greenest! Their plight, except to certain masters of a socio-literary critical apparatus which disposes of the problem all too rapidly,<sup>2</sup> is extremely difficult of diagnosis. To practitioners of comparative literature, whose discipline "stands at the frontiers to view what is exchanged, seeking to measure foreign contributions in the mystery of aesthetic creation," it presents a real challenge.

Outward marks of Dr. Mackay's allegiance to the *comparatiste* school are manifold. Her successful effort to write prose at once erudite and readable, to present a well printed page, to suppress all unnecessary footnotes (which in this case has resulted in the suppression of some necessary or at least desirable ones as well—see pages 74, 75, 237 and 239), are characteristic. Equally so is her willingness, whenever ascertainable fact is not at hand, to propose a wealth of hypothesis in answer to many questions, and to explain much about Meredith by generalizations on the French national psychology as opposed to the English.

Both Emile Legouis and M. René Galland<sup>3</sup> had already noted the prominent Gallic traits in the author of the *Essay on the Comic Spirit*, and indicated the paths for Dr. Mackay to follow. She has done so, with fidelity and competence, through chapters dealing with Meredith's education, his marriages (both of which brought him into contact with France), his French journeys, his familiarity with the French civilization he praised so highly (including menus of French dinners he enjoyed), his French *Odes* (in which she finds him superior to Hugo on similar themes), *Beauchamp's Career* and the other novels which have to do with the French. Not infrequently the trails grew cold. M. Galland's belief, for example, that Meredith's youth was influenced by exposure to the

1. "As to me, there seems a chance in America, where I may come to my end—not among our good English to whom I am odious and nauseous (I quote them)."—*Letters of G.M. Collected and Edited by his Son*, New York, Scribner, 1912, II, 432.

2. See the James homage issue of *Hound and Horn*, April-June, 1934.

3. Emile Legouis, "L'Egoïste de George Meredith," *Revue Germanique*, I, 403. M. René Galland, *George Meredith, les cinquante premières années*, Paris, Les Presses Françaises, 1923. M. Galland, translator as well as critic of Meredith, directed Dr. Mackay's work at the University of Bordeaux.

French liberal ideas of 1848, receives from her only passing attention. Very often, documents necessary to close an important question are unavailable, thanks to the personal reticence which led Meredith to discontinue his autobiography and to the fact that various other important papers are missing. Distance prevented Dr. Mackay's using the Meredithiana in the Altshul collection at Yale. Thus it is not surprising that she is at her best when treating directly Meredith's published works and that where she is harrassed by lack of essential documents the dangers inherent to her method become most apparent.

Her handling of the question of Meredith's honeymoon itinerary with Mary Ellen Nicholls is a case in point. Meredith's letters show that the pair visited Germany, but not that they visited France. Yet we know that the bride loved France and spoke the language. Did they go there? Certainly it would have been natural to please bride as well as groom, at least this early in what proved a stormy married life. The fly in the ointment is that no evidence shows this to have been the case. The Merediths were not rich, and for all that can be proven now, financial expediency may have prompted a direct return from Germany to England. Yet Dr. Mackay devotes several pages of her text (pages 16-19) to what the Merediths found France to be at that time, providing they did get to France at all. To this procedure, used sparingly, there is no serious objection. But the reader's confidence is undermined by recurrent phrases like, "On peut le supposer" (page 25), "Il semble très naturel de supposer" (*Ibid.*), "Nous sommes donc bien fondés à croire" (page 39), "Meredith appréciait dans ces tableaux, sans doute" (page 55), and by a too general conjugation of the *avoir dû*, *passim*. Even statements well supported by fact come to seem untrustworthy.

Especially is this true when coupled with Dr. Mackay's essays in Anglo-French national psychology. No ground is more thoroughly debatable. Meredith himself, in *Celt and Saxon*, has furnished a sample of how unsatisfactory such racial comparisons can be. But Dr. Mackay writes, "Une vive personnalité n'est pas un trait caractéristique de la jeune femme anglaise. . . . La jeune fille française est supérieure par sa personnalité, sa grâce et surtout par son charme" (page 123). And, with reference to Meredith's second marriage, "Marie Vulliamy conservait, sous sa culture française, des qualités nettement nordiques; elle parlait peu."<sup>4</sup> Fortunately this habit of the author merely serves as a warning of how far the spirit of comparison carries its apprentices, and does not detract from the value of the rest of her work.

For Dr. Mackay has gotten more than a dusty answer. Meredith's admira-

4. Page 68. The rest of the passage is suppressed not for humorous effect but for lack of space. Further examples of the same type are easily available in Dr. Mackay's work. This type of "race thinking" has recently been treated by Dr. Jacques Barzun (*Race, Harcourt-Brace*, 1937) who, although he does not mention comparative literature, cites *Celt and Saxon*. It is interesting to contemplate to what extent the comparative school is vulnerable to Dr. Barzun's strictures.



tion for France, she reports, was dictated by his emotions, while to his intelligence Germany made the greater appeal. She speaks of course in relative terms, not forgetting that Meredith was an intellectual, as opposed to emotional, type. Now, that France should have played so great a part in the life and work of an intellectual whose intellect leaned rather toward Germany than toward France is sufficiently paradoxical. The point is that the paradox is not of Dr. Mackay's making. It is Meredith's. And it is closely related to our original problem, if indeed it is not our problem itself in another guise.

She has made it perfectly clear that this man who urged French comedy on England and then wrote a novel, perhaps his best, to illustrate his theory, was no less English for all that. He viewed France with abundant sympathy, but from the outside, like a Briton on the grand tour. The French traits he recommended to his compatriots were to be a leavening, a palliative for what he deplored in the English temperament.

His knowledge of France was hardly commensurate with his zeal. As editor for Chapman he had been forced to read French books more extensively than the actual records show. (Here Miss Mackay's method seems amply justified.) His six trips to France of which we know, plus the two or three more he may have taken, make an astonishingly small total for a leading Francophile who lived only across the Channel! It is significant that his description of French places is inexact in detail when he risks detail, and that when he referred to his wife's property in Normandy, he transformed a relatively modest dwelling into a Château. Perhaps related to this is his thinking of the same lady as French, although her antecedents were rather less French than Anglo-Swiss. As one follows Dr. Mackay, the evidence becomes more and more convincing. Meredith's feeling for France was never a symptom of equilibrium between emotions and intellect, and never one of equilibrium of judgment.

Dr. Mackay has probed deeply into the relationship between Meredith's discomfort at home and his love for France, and, although she offers no finished diagnosis, whoever wishes may proceed from where she has stopped, with confidence in the conclusions she has reached by the clever and sometimes brilliant manipulation of a somewhat dangerous method.

W. M. FROHOCK

Columbia University

---

*Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français.* Par RAPHAEL LEVY. New York, Modern Language Association of America, 1937. Pp. x + 64.

In keeping with the laudable present-day American tendency to catalogue and systematize our available stock of linguistic and bibliographical information in the French and Provençal fields, this brief work forms a corollary to the Linguistic Society's recent publication *A Census of French and Provençal Dialect Dictionaries in American Libraries*.



The compiler has here included, in a single, handy volume, lists which comprise: I. dictionaries, chrestomathies and collections of writings; II. all editions of eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth century works which contain glossaries of appreciable importance and usefulness; III. an analytical index of such works, which enables the reader to find, at a minute's notice, all glossaries relating to any particular work or author; IV. non-existing or incomplete glossaries for works of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; V. glossaries of modern authors; VI. an index of all the compilers of the editions mentioned in the foregoing sections; VII. the American libraries in which are to be found rare copies of some of the editions mentioned.

While the lists offered are not exhaustive (the compiler states that editions containing exceedingly brief glossaries have not been included, and that where there are several editions of the same text only the most important and recent have been selected), they are fairly abundant for all ordinary purposes of research, and will greatly simplify the labors of students and scholars engaged in any form of investigation dealing with Old French.

MARIO A. PEI

Columbia University

---

*Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie offerts à Jacques van Ginneken.* Paris, Klincksieck, 1937. Pp. li + 361.

This symposium, prepared on the occasion of the sixtieth birthday of one of Holland's most eminent linguists, presents a formidable array of literary and glottological talent from numerous lands.

The science of experimental and applied phonetics is represented in articles contributed by M. J. Sirks, L. Kaiser, R. Jakobson, P. Menzerath, N. van Wijk, J. Vachek, A. Gemelli and R. H. Stetson. Morphological and syntactical problems of a general nature are treated in contributions by V. Brøndal, L. Hjelmslev, S. Karcevsky, A. Belić, V. Mathesius, B. Weerenbeck. A point of linguistic terminology is discussed by H. Lindroth. The mythology of prehistoric groups appears treated in two interesting articles by W. Schmidt and W. Koppers. An excellent discussion of the Caucasian group of languages is contributed by N. Trubetzkoy, K. Bouda, A. Sommerfelt and C. Tagliavini, while Indo-European origins are sought by E. Benveniste and J. Kuryl'owicz. The Kushitic and Kabiric groups are discussed respectively by J. Wils and C. H. de Goeje, the problem of the river *Eridanos* by P. Kretschmer, Eolian phonetics in Homer by V. Magnien, umlaut phenomena in Celtic and Germanic by E. Rooth, the Germanic accent by Th. Baader, proper names by A. H. Gardiner, the development of Romazi writing in Japan by A. Tanakadate.

In four articles written from widely diversified points of view, M. Bartoli, J. Mikkola, R. Huss and A. Cuny resurrect the unsolved problem of the monogenesis of language. The first, upon the basis of vocabulary similarities between the tongues of the American Indians and such other widely scattered groups

as Korean, Australian, Nilotic, Tibeto-Burmese and Indo-European, postulates that the monogenesis of the world's languages appears far more probable than polygenesis, a conclusion calling for far more evidence than that hitherto adduced; the second is more cautious, and limits himself to presenting the problem of certain similarities between the Indo-European and the Finno-Ugrian tongues; in a general study entitled "Fremdethnische Grundlage und Sprachgrenzen," Huss goes much further when he claims that "das Finnisch-Ugrische scheint in gewissem Sinne eine Uralaltaisierung von Indogermanisch darzustellen"; while Cuny advances as an established fact the kinship of Indo-European with Hamito-Semitic. The entire problem, as well as the partial aspects here presented, appears to be fairly bristling with question marks.

V. Bertoldi, in his "Plurale Mediterraneo in Residui Fossili," presents the case of the place-name suffix *-ar(a)* and builds up on it a common pre-Indo-European Mediterranean civilization extending from the Caucasus to the Basque country and finding an outlet in the Creto-Hellenic and Etrusco-Latin cultures.

A careful study of phonetico-syntactic phenomena in a group of Alpine dialects is offered by A. Duraffour, while Salverda de Grave contributes the only purely literary study in the collection in his article on "Giraut de Borneil et la poésie obscure."

J. Vendryes, in a masterly article on the use of the auxiliary "to have" to indicate the past tense, musters examples from a multitude of widely separated Indo-European languages to indicate that this use corresponds to a psychological necessity felt at different times and in various localities. He concedes that Greek and Latin may have encouraged each other in this innovation, and that in the Romance period the influence of the Church may have accounted for its extension to the Germanic tongues.

A lesser amount of justification and evidence, in our opinion, attends A. Dauzat's claim of the influence of a Germanic substratum in the evolution of French phonology. His main contention is that the northern band of French dialects which reject the palatalization of *c + a* is influenced by Germanic habits of pronunciation, due to a larger proportion of the Germanic element in the population of those regions. If we accept this contention, a strange problem arises in connection with Provençal, which also rejects this form of palatalization. In a discussion of the chronology of palatalization (page 268), the author places the evolution of *ca > cha* at approximately 615, on the ground that at that period *ch* spellings begin to appear; but the burden of evidence<sup>1</sup> seems to indicate that these spellings reflect not a palatalized, but a harsh guttural sound. And when the author attributes the modern Norman-Picard *tšuré* (*curé*) to a resurgence of the primitive Celtic substratum after eight centuries of predominance of a Germanic superstratum (page 271), the

1. Cf. Pei, *Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France*, pp. 77, 82, 110-112.

temptation to look askance upon all substratum theories based upon such far-flung inductions grows strong indeed.

MARIO A. PEI

Columbia University

*Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900. Tome IX: La Révolution et l'Empire, Deuxième Partie: Les Événements, les institutions et la langue.*

Par FERDINAND BRUNOT. Paris, Armand Colin, 1937. Pp. xxviii + 617-1276.

The second volume of Tome IX of the *Histoire de la langue française* completes the section in this monumental work devoted to the period of the Revolution and the Empire.

In tome IX, 1, the author had written the external history of the language: how French had been made consciously, deliberately, the national language. Certainly it had been progressing in that direction for a long time but somewhat in a haphazard way; the Revolution—but not so much the Empire—undertook a systematic effort to eliminate the remaining *patois* or dialects and foreign languages. The story as told by Brunot is of course a fascinating one. But although there was progress, the results were not so complete as one would have thought. Neither German, nor Breton, nor Basque, nor Italian yielded very much to the official coercion and even the Provençal and French *patois* stood their ground pretty well: the elementary school system that was to be so effective against them was not to be established until much later, and, on the other hand, the necessity of carrying on ideological propaganda compelled the Revolutionary governments to use the languages best understood by the people. Progress would have been faster perhaps if for instance the Abbé Grégoire's motion before the Convention had been made an enforceable law: he proposed that in order to be granted a marriage license every future couple should prove that they knew French.

Volume 2 of Tome IX gives the internal history of the language during the same period. Professor Brunot uses, in both sections of the work, the same method of dividing up his subjects into a great many parts. As he says (page 1115) the material is so abundant and entangled (*touffu*) that he has to do so to digest it. The book is divided in four periods: three for the Revolution and one for the Empire, ten books and one hundred and one chapters.

The author's purpose has been to show the effect upon the language of all the new thoughts and ideas or points of view, passions, interests, customs, governments, administrations, institutions, economy, industry, commerce, agriculture, political and social events. Only the vocabulary is generally considered but even so the subject is enormous, and M. Brunot applies here the doctrine which he has expounded in *La Pensée et la langue*. This he had not done in the section devoted to the classical period.

It is fascinating to follow the history of this momentous period, 1789-1815, on the linguistic side. In fact Professor Brunot writes the history of the Revolution and the Empire through the words which they used, whence the striking

human intimacy of this history. The passions at white-heat explode in a fury of creations, many of them short-lived. For instance the fervor of patriotism creates the terms *nationomicide*, *nationimicide*, *nationicide*, *nationiticide*, for the traitors to their country. New social concepts bring in new terms (page 706): *agraire*, *prolétaire*, *classe ouvrière*, *classes*, *bourgeois* (disparagingly). But the words *nationalisme* and *nationaliste* have not come in yet and *capitaliste*, which appears, has only a vague meaning.

The production of words is at its best (or worst) in connection with the popular aspects of the movements; the development from the stem of *sans-culotte* is rich indeed: *sans-culottisme*, *sans-culottide*, *sans-culottier*, *sans-culotterie*, *sans-culottisation*, etc. Even the communist Babeuf will divide society into two classes: the "peuple culotté" and the "peuple déculotté"!

This new terminology, which not only reflects the multifarious impact of the Revolution and, to a lesser extent, that of the Empire on the social consciousness, but was also an effective instrument of action, is strikingly brought out in the short chapters of the work.

As pointed out already, not all of these neologisms took root in the language. Some, on the other hand, entered the international vocabulary of civilization. Already Kant in 1790, in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, congratulated the French for having created the typical word of modern times: *organisation* (page 721). With the new "post-thermidorian" consciousness of a world whose progress must be based on preservation of the best of the past, *conservateur* comes in—and *vandalisme* for wanton destruction. The progress of "organisation" based on science introduces the metric system, and, after some hesitations and gropings, a nomenclature which has conquered the world. *Parachute*, *javelle* (water), *télégraphe*, *sous-marin*, *machine à vapeur*, *gaz* (*d'éclairage*) belong here also.

Every section of the population, every event, every activity supplies its quota. Even the dearth of goods and supplies obliges the housewives to stand in line when they go shopping and marketing; the picturesque expression: *faire la queue* is created (page 1169) and the *cartes de pain et de viande* acquire an unenviable celebrity. The various popular groups put into circulation a considerable number of slang expressions which have not all gone out of fashion: *raccourcir* with the *guillotine* is still heard; so is *boire à la grande tasse* (to be drowned in the sea). The soldiers' slang of the time has remained still more alive: *une raclée* or *une peignée* (a "walloping"), *chipier*, *ratatouille*, *fricoteur*, *une calotte*, *grogner*, *vieux de la vieille*, etc. The share of the Empire in this growth is naturally larger.

The numerous executions of the reign of Terror brought out a number of ironical euphemistic expressions such as *dissiper républicainement* (to shoot crowds at a time). The legal drownings in the Loire at Nantes under Carrier were called "*baignades nationales*" (page 881), and every one understands the allusions in *lanterner*, *maratiser*, *septembriser*. *Mariages républicains* (the latter type of execution: a man and a woman tied together and thrown into river or sea) is not however authentic (page 885).

Finally there is the vogue, almost carried to exaggeration, as a means of advertising, of forming word compounds out of Greek for new scientific and industrial developments: *polygraphique*, *anémographe*, *alcoomètre*, *photomètre*, *cristallotechnie*, *toxicologie* (page 1221). The nomenclature of the metric system should partly belong here.

This is a period in which Brunot's method of dividing up his subject to the limit and accumulating facts and anecdotes—with very few central and general ideas—gives the most adequate and satisfactory results.

As already said, this picture of the French Revolution from the linguistic point of view reaches into the general realm of history in a peculiar manner. One can feel that no history of the Revolution will be complete without it. It is indeed one of the most original aspects of that Revolution, one that renders the fever, trepidation, characteristics of the period most adequately and interestingly.

HENRI F. MULLER

Columbia University

---

*France: A Companion to French Studies.* Edited by R. L. GRAEME RITCHIE. London, Methuen, 1937. Pp. 514.

Like the earlier volumes of the series, those of Spain, Germany, and Italy, this is a work of collaboration. Several chapters have been done by the editor; others have been contributed by Professors Lytton Sells, Boase, Roe, by Sisley Huddleston, R. H. Wilenski, and others.

Considering a book of this type one thinks inevitably of Professor Tilley's *Medieval France*, and *Modern France*, two volumes whose worth has been tested over a number of years. There is no space for comparison, but one may note that the present work will in nowise supplant Tilley's more scholarly treatment, though some of the chapters may be taken as supplementary thereto. The best pages: Chapter VI (Graeme Ritchie) dealing with the eighteenth century, with emphasis on Anglo-French relations; Chapter X (Boase) which with an admirable sense of order and proportion discusses contemporary literature; and Chapter XIII (Wilenski) which treats of the important phases of French painting.

The medieval and Renaissance periods have been omitted. One would agree that the Middle Ages are within the province of another book, but that the history of France "by common consent" begins with the seventeenth century is open to question, especially in a text designed as a companion to French studies. The modern era for Europe—and for France, despite the intervention of the Wars of Religion—began in 1519-1530, or at latest in 1548. English history dates slightly later, from the Armada. It is obvious, however, that the picture of literary development from 1550-1650, in itself a unit, is distorted by failure to include the Renaissance, and that the plan disregards two universally known figures, Rabelais and Montaigne, not to mention others.

Mr. Huddleston's chapter, "Present-Day France," up-to-date and easy to

read, furnishes a good conspectus of 1914-1936. One point not made clear is that much of the bickering among the Allies in 1918, and thereafter, is attributable to Britain's legitimate desire to thwart any possibility of French hegemony on the continent. Hence the need to preserve Germany relatively intact as the checkmate.

The volume is served up with modernized diction, with an occasional colloquial tinge (Cf. "percolated through," page 213; "fed up," page 359; "cold-shouldered," page 143; "regimentation," page 29; "paint the town red," page 147; etc.), though on the whole conservatively written. There is a good index, and each chapter terminates with a short bibliography. In sum: not an epochal work, but one which for general purposes is stimulating and useful.

I. W. BROCK

Emory University

---

*Guide des Bibliothèques de Paris.* Par EMILE LEROY. Paris, Editions des Bibliothèques Nationales, 1937. Pp. viii + 283.

Scholars, French or foreign, who have occasion to consult the immense collections of Paris will find this book indispensable. All the data that could be put into a convenient pocket-volume are here. Twelve chapters take one across all Paris (and to Chantilly, Versailles and Saint-Germain) and through a hundred libraries. At every point one is given the essential information about admission, hours, formalities of the Salles de Travail, systems of catalogues, consultation of MSS, permission to make photostatic copies and their cost, etc., etc. The tone is, naturally, impersonal, and yet there is the impression of hospitality, of a desire to lead each reader to precisely the *rayons* which hold what he wants.

Such guidance has been a crying need in the presence of the 4,000,000 books of the B.N., the 1,000,000 of the Arsenal, the 700,000 of the Sorbonne, the 450,000 of the Ecole Normale, the 350,000 of the Mazarine—to mention only a few of the possibilities. The mere physical dimensions are brought home to us when we are told that transferring the collections of provisional newspapers from the B.N. to Versailles has freed 13 kilometers of shelves in the rue Richelieu. For Romance scholars the richness seems inexhaustible: the Gaston Paris library of Philology (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes), the Fonds hispanique (Versailles), the Fonds Rondel, a unique collection for the history of drama (Arsenal), the sixteenth-century, and nineteenth-century Lovenjoul, collections (Chantilly), the Fonds Beljame, Shakespeare in France (Sorbonne), the Rousseau items (Chambre des Députés), etc., etc.

Readable *historiques* introduce various chapters and provide an interesting survey of the development of the great institutions and even a glimpse of the evolution in librarian technique, and mentality, from the early catalogue classification that began with "A-Ecriture sainte" and descended to "Y<sub>2</sub>-Romans," to the modern arrangement (installed at the B.N. in 1936) of cards in steel filing-cases.

H. S.



---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

---

- Baker, Sister Imogene, *The King's Household in the Arthurian Court from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Malory*. Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America, 1937. Pp. x+166.
- Boorsch, Jean, *Etat présent des études sur Descartes*. (Etudes Françaises) Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1937. Pp. x+196.
- Carrière, Joseph Médard, *Tales from the French Folk-Lore of Missouri* (Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, Number 1) Evanston, Northwestern University, 1937. Pp. viii+354.
- Chroniques de Jean Molinet*. Publiées par Georges Doutrepoint et Omer Jodogne. Tome I: (1474-1488); Tome II: (1488-1506); Tome III: Introduction. Glossaire. Index. (Académie Royale de Belgique. Collection des Anciens Auteurs Belges) Bruxelles, Palais des Académies, T. I, 1935, pp. 654; T. II, 1935, pp. 606; T. III, 1937, pp. 447.
- Das Buch vom "Espurgatoire S. Patrice" der Marie de France und seine Quelle*. Herausgegeben von Karl Warnke. (Bibliotheca Normannica, IX) Halle (Saale), Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1938. Pp. viii+LII+178.
- Doutrepoint, Georges, and Omer Jodogne, SEE *Chroniques de Jean Molinet*.
- Eicke, Werner Adolf, *Léon Bazalgette (1873-1929) und seine Anschauungen über Latinität und Germanentum*. Bonn, Verlag Gebr. Scheur, 1937. Pp. 85.
- Focillon, Henri, *Art d'Occident: Le Moyen Age roman et gothique*. Paris, Colin, 1938. Pp. vi+361.
- Frank, Grace, and Dorothy Miner, *Proverbs en rimes*. (Text and Illustrations of the Fifteenth Century from a French Manuscript in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore) Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. viii+117+180 plates.
- Graaf, J. de, *Le Réveil littéraire en Hollande et le naturalisme français (1880-1900)*. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1938. Pp. 227.
- Grahame, Kenneth, *Au Royaume des enfants: Jours de rêve*. Traduit de l'anglais par Léo Lack. Paris, Mercure de France, 1937. Pp. 201.
- Grubb, Armstead Otey, *French Sports Neologisms*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1937. Pp. vii+84.
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von, *Essai sur Victor Hugo*. Traduit de l'allemand par Maria Ley-Deutsch. (Bibliothèque de la Fondation Victor Hugo, v) Paris, E. Droz, 1937. Pp. x+89.
- Hoppe, Ruth, *Die romanische Geste im Rolandslied*. Königsberg—Berlin, Ost-Europa-Verlag, 1937. Pp. viii+184.
- Kany, Charles E., *The Beginnings of the Epistolary Novel in France, Italy*



- and *Spain*. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Volume 21, No. 1) Berkeley, University of California, 1937. Pp. x+158.
- Lack, Léo, *SEE* Grahame.
- Ley-Deutsch, Maria, *SEE* Hofmannsthal.
- Los *fueros de Aragón*. Según el manuscrito 458 de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. Publicados por Gunnar Tilander. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1937. Pp. lxxvi+645.
- Olbrich, Rolf, *Syntaktisch-stilistische Studien über Benito Pérez Galdos*. (Hamburger Studien zu Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen) Hamburg, Paul Evert Verlag, 1937. Pp. xiv+155.
- Pellegrini, Silvio, *Studi su trove e trovatori della prima lirica ispano-portoghese*. Torino, Casa Editrice Giuseppe Gambino, 1937. Pp. 113.
- Porteau, Paul, *Montaigne et la vie pédagogique de son temps*. Paris, E. Droz, 1935. Pp. 330.
- Reichenburg, Louisette, *Contribution à l'histoire de la "Querelle des Bouffons"*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937. Pp. 133.
- Sennewaldt, Clotilde, *Les "Miracles de Sainte Genevieve"*. Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1937. Pp. 183.
- Siegfried, André, *Qu'est-ce que l'Amérique?* Paris, Flammarion, 1937. Pp. 48.
- Spencer and Schevill, *The Dramatic Works of Luis Vélez de Guevara. Their Plots, Sources and Bibliography*. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Volume 19) Berkeley, University of California Press, 1937. Pp. xxvi+387.
- Starkie, Enid, *Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia*. (Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature) New York, Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. vi+158.
- Taylor, Alan Carey, *Carlyle et la pensée latine*. (Etudes de Littérature Etrangère et Comparée) Paris, Boivin, 1938. Pp. viii+442.
- Taylor, Alan Carey, *Le Président de Broches et l'Australie*. (Etudes de Littérature Etrangère et Comparée) Paris, Boivin, 1938. Pp. 190.
- Tilander, Gunnar, *SEE* Los *fueros de Aragón*.
- Vandérem, Fernand, *Gens de qualité*. Paris, Librairie Plon, 1938. Pp. 252.
- Warnke, Karl, *SEE* Das *Buch vom "Espurgatoire S. Patrice"*.
- Wels, L. E., *Theologische Streifzüge durch die Altfranzösische Literatur*. (Erste Reihe) Vechta, Albertus-Magnus-Verlag, 1937. Pp. xxii+113.
- Winkler, Emil, *Zur Geschichte des Begriffs "Comédie" in Frankreich*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1937. Pp. 31.

## TEXT-BOOKS

- Bagley, Charles R., *An Introduction to French Literature of the Seventeenth Century*. New York, Appleton-Century, 1937. Pp. xiii+498.
- Willett and Scanlon, *A Basic-Vocabulary Spanish Reader*. With word-building exercises. New York, Crofts, 1937. Pp. ix+150.

## NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

1. All manuscripts should be typewritten and double-spaced with ample margins.
2. Quotations in any language of over four or five typewritten lines will generally be printed in small roman as separate paragraphs (set-down matter). In the typescript such extracts should be in a separate paragraph single-spaced and should not be enclosed in quotation marks.
3. Titles of books and periodicals will be italicized and should be underlined in the typescript. Titles of articles, chapters and poems should be in roman enclosed in quotation marks.
4. In titles of English publications, in titles of periodicals in any language except German, and in divisions of English works (parts, chapters, sections, poems, articles, etc.), the first word and all the principal words should be capitalized. Ex:

*The Comedy of Errors*

In the *Romanic Review* there appeared an article entitled "Flaubert's Correspondence with Louise Colet, Chronology and Notes."

Such a repetition may be found in the Preface. (But: James Gray wrote the preface for the second edition.)

5. In an English passage French titles should have the article capitalized and underlined as part of the title. Ex: He read *La France vivante*. In a French passage, the article should be neither capitalized nor underlined. Ex: Il a lu *la France vivante et l'Histoire de la littérature française de Lanson*.
6. In an English passage, French and Italian titles should be capitalized as follows. The first word is always capitalized. If a substantive immediately follows an initial article, definite or indefinite, it is also capitalized. If the substantive is preceded by an adjective, this also receives a capital letter. If the title begins with any other word than an article or an adjective, the words following are all in lower-case. Ex: *Les*

*Femmes savantes; La Folle Journée; L'Âge ingrat; De la terre à la lune; Sur la piste; La Leda senza cigno; Scrittori del tempo nostro; I Narratori; Nell'azzurro; Piccolo Mondo antico.*

7. Spanish titles should have a capital only on the first word unless the title contains a proper noun. Ex: *Cantigas de amor e de maldizer; La perfecta casada.*
8. Words or phrases not in the language of the article, and not yet naturalized, will be italicized and should be underlined in the typescript. Consult the dictionary if in doubt. Ex: *genre, pièce à thèse, ancien régime, Zeitgeist.*
9. All quotations should correspond exactly with the original in wording, spelling, and punctuation. Words or phrases in quotations must not be italicized or underlined unless they are so in the original or unless it is indicated in a footnote that the italics have been added. Any interpolation in an extract should be indicated by enclosing it in brackets; any omission should be indicated by three periods. Ex: "It is this work [*Le Lys dans la vallée*] which—" ; "It est . . . absorbé par des travaux—."
10. Footnotes should be numbered consecutively throughout each article or book-review. In the text the note number should be printed as a superior figure (slightly above the typed line); at the head of the note itself, it should be a figure of normal size followed by a period (on a level with the typed line). Ex: At eighteen, he moved to Paris.<sup>1</sup>
  1. John Palmer, *Studies in the Contemporary Theatre*, p. 48.
11. Footnotes may be typed into the article itself, separated from the text by ruled lines, or subjoined to the end of the text, on separate pages.
12. Note numbers in the text always follow the punctuation. Ex: There is no question as to the date of this edition.<sup>2</sup> As Flaubert stated,<sup>3</sup> he was willing to—.
13. Short references included in the text to save footnotes, should be enclosed

in parentheses and should not contain abbreviations. In book-reviews this is often the easiest way to make a direct reference to the work which is being reviewed. Ex: In the Introduction (page 10), the author remarks—

14. Names should never be abbreviated. Even the name of the author of a work which is being reviewed should be written out each time that it is used.

15. All footnotes must begin with a capital letter and end with a period or some other final punctuation. Each note should contain an exact reference to the page or pages in question; the title is rarely enough. If a footnote refers to the same title cited in the preceding note, *ibid.* should be used to avoid repeating the title. If a note refers to a work already cited, but not cited in the preceding footnote, *op. cit.* should be used for a book, *loc. cit.* for an article. Such abbreviations should not ordinarily be used to refer farther back than the preceding page. Since the aim, however, is merely to avoid ambiguity, no rule need be laid down. Ex:

10. Cross, Slover, *Ancient Irish Tales*, p. 35.

11. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, p. 90.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

13. W. A. Nitze, "Lancelot and Guenevere," *Speculum*, VIII, 240.

14. Loomis, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

15. Nitze, *loc. cit.*, p. 249.

16. In the citation of references the amount of bibliographical detail is left to the discretion of the contributor, but the order of the items should be presented as indicated below. Inclusion of items (3), (4), and (5) is optional with the contributor.

In the case of books cited, the form of reference should be as follows: (1) author's name, preceded by his first name or initials, (2) the title italicized (underlined), (3) where necessary, the edition, (4) place of publication, (5) name of publisher, (6) date of publication, (7) reference to volume in capital roman numerals without preceding 'Vol.'

or 'V.', (8) reference to page in arabic numerals, preceded by 'p.' or 'pp.' only when there is no preceding reference to volume. Each item but the last should be followed by a comma; the last item should be followed by a period. Ex:

Albert Thibaudet, *Histoire de la littérature française de 1789 à nos jours*, Paris, Stock, 1936, p. 60.

H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind*, 4th ed., New York, Macmillan, 1925, II, 221-225.

17. Reference to periodicals should include, wherever possible, volume number and page number or numbers. Where it is desirable to give the year also, it should follow the volume number, in parentheses. When it is impossible to give a volume number, the date of the issue should take its place. Ex:

*La Nouvelle Revue Française*, II (1909), 224.

*Les Nouvelles Littéraires*, 30 juillet 1932, p. 8.

18. The following periodicals should be abbreviated as follows in footnotes:

*Gröbers Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*—GG

*Modern Language Journal*—MLJ

*Modern Language Notes*—MLN

*Modern Philology*—MP

*Publications of the Modern Language Association*—PMLA

*Romania*—R

*Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France*—RHL

*Revue de Littérature Comparée*—RLC

*Romanic Review*—RR

*Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*—ZFSL

*Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*—ZRP

19. The following Latin words and abbreviations will be italicized and should be underlined in typescript. They should be capitalized only when they begin a footnote. *ca.* (about, in dates), *e.g.* (for instance), *et al.* (and others), *ibid.* (not *ib.* or *idem.*, the same reference), *i.e.* (that is), *loc. cit.* (place cited), *op. cit.* (work cited), *passim* (here and there), *sic* (thus), *vs.* (versus). Exceptions are: etc., viz.

20. The following abbreviations will appear in roman type and therefore should not be underlined in typescript: cf., f., ff. (following), fol., foll. (folio, folios), l., ll. (line, lines), p. pp., vol., vs., vss. verses). Mme and Mlle, MS and MSS (manuscript, manuscripts) should be typed without periods.

21. Headings for book-reviews should follow these models:

*Jules Sandeau, l'homme et la vie.* Par Mabel Silver. Paris, Boivin, 1936. Pp. 247.

*A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century.* By Professor Henry Carrington Lancaster. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press. *Part I* (1610-1634), 2 vols., 1920. Pp. 785. *Part II* (1635-1651), 2 vols., 1932. Pp. 804. *Part III* (1652-1672), 2 vols., 1936. Pp. 896.

22. All references in the completed manuscript should be verified before it is submitted for publication.

23. Contributors should retain an accurate carbon copy of their manuscripts.

---

# LESAGE • GIL BLAS

---

EDITED BY L. H. SKINNER AND L. S. BRADY, MIAMI UNIVERSITY

Lesage's great picaresque novel, abridged and edited for early reading. Witty—exciting—worthwhile for language and background.

List Price: \$1.28

---

---

## ALTERNATIVE NEW FRENCH READER

---

BY H. E. FORD AND R. K. HICKS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

A collection of contemporary and classic favorites. Features a running "double" vocabulary: Part I, the primary working vocabulary, appears at the top half of each page; Part II, at the bottom of each page, contains the extra words or "inevitables" and all easily recognizable cognates.

Probable List Price: \$1.28

---

---

## HENRY HOLT • NEW YORK

---

### ISTITUTO INTERUNIVERSITARIO ITALIANO ROME, ITALY

#### Learn the Language—Literature—History—Culture of Italy in Italy

##### 1938 SPRING AND SUMMER COURSES

ROME—Language, literature, and civilization. Also lectures on Roman archaeology (in English and Italian). Other courses: *Rome and the Orient*; *Italy and the formation of the new Eastern European States*; *The educational and social work of the Fascist Regime* (in English); *Italy and the Americas* (in English, Spanish, and Italian); *Italy and the Northern European Countries*.

FLORENCE—Language, literature, history, applied arts, history of art and music, civilization. Also a special course on Italian Renaissance by Papini, Cecchi, and Volpe.

PERUGIA—Language, literature, art, history, Etruscology, higher culture, and methods of teaching Italian.

##### Other courses at

AREZZO, FAENZA, MILAN, PALERMO, PISA, RAVENNA, SIENA, VENICE.

---

Inservice credit for New York City teachers.

---

Write for leaflet:

ITALIAN INTERUNIVERSITY BUREAU  
Casa Italiana—Columbia University—New York City

